ORIGINAL ARTICLE

The Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire: Italian translation and linguistic validation

C. SCARINZI, P. BERCHIALLA*, M. GHIDINA**, P. ROZBOWSKY**, L. PILOTTO***, M.C. ALBANESE***, P.M. FIORETTI***, D. GREGORI*

Department of Statistics and Applied Mathematics, University of Turin; *Department of Public Health and Microbiology, University of Turin, Italy; ** IRCAB Foundation, Udine; *** Policlinic "Santa Maria della Misericordia",

Department of Cardiovascular Sciences, Udine, Italy

Key words

Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire • Heart failure • Quality of Life

Summary

Introduction. The quality of life (QoL) is an important outcome indicator for heart failure management. As the use of a validate questionnaire in a different cultural context can affect data interpretation our main objective is the Italian translation and linguistic validation of the Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire (SHF) and its comparison with the MLHF (Minnesota Living with Heart Failure) Questionnaire.

Methods. The SHF and "The Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire" were translated. A consensus involving parallel back-translations was established among a group of

cardiologists, psychologists and biostatisticians. SHF and MLHF were both administrated to a sample of 50 patients

Results. The patients' median age was 63 years. Ace inhibitors therapy was administered in 88% of cases and betablockers in 56% of cases. Finally the Italian version of SHF correlates well with MLHF for all domains, except life satisfaction SHF domain.

Discussion: The Italian version of the SHF correlates well with MLHF for almost all domains and it represents a valid alternative for quality of life assessment in heart failure patients.

Introduction

The prevalence of symptomatic heart failure in the general European population ranges from 0.4% to 2.0% [1]. Heart failure in Italy is one of the most frequent causes of hospitalization (second medical DRG in Italy in 2001). Patients affected by heart failure have a compromised quality of life (QoL) [2-4]. Although decreasing mortality and improving the prognosis are major end points of the treatment, QoL is an important outcome indicator for heart failure management indeed, the "health related quality of life" could be considered one of the most important outcomes for the evaluation of treatments and improvement of the strategies [5, 6] in such patients.

In literature there is a substantial agreement in considering QoL a multidimensional phenomenon which could be analyzed through different perspectives: the physical, the psychological, the social and the economic well being or status of patients.

Health related QoL assessment could be done using generic or disease specific measures: the specific questionnaires allow the measurement of the clinical relevant domains, and are sensitive in identifying clinical changes.

Several generic and specific disease questionnaires have been established to measure treatment effects but the assessment of QoL using a developed and validated instrument in a different cultural context can affect data interpretation [7].

The main objective of this study was the Italian translation and linguistic validation of the Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire (SHF).

Methods

THE QUESTIONNAIRES

SHF is a quite old and widely used [8], 26 items, disease specific health status measure for patients with congestive heart failure which covers somatic, psychological, life dissatisfaction and physical limitations. Higher scores indicate lower heart related QoL [9].

"The Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire" (MLHF) is a questionnaire which has been applied in most of the researches on heart failure patients: it is a 21 items questionnaire which using a 6 point response scale assess patient's Emotional and Physical dimensions, and a General Total Score [10]. The Italian version of the MLHF has been produced by the MAPI Research Institute (www.mapi-research.fr) and it is available by them upon request.

THE TRANSLATION

The linguistic adaptation was performed following a standardized protocol. The linguistic validation is a linguistically validated translation which allows the assessment in the relevant target countries: it is conceptu-

ally equivalent to the original questionnaire ensuring the cross-cultural equivalence across translations.

The linguistic validation follows several steps. In our process, after the production of two independent translations by two professional translators' native speakers in the target language, a professional English native translator produced the backward translation. Then the original version, the developed Italian version and the back translation were compared discussing any discrepancy with expert cardiologists and psychologists. A cognitive debriefing, consisting in interviews with patients, was done to test the interpretability of the resulting version. Finally an international harmonization, consisting in a comparison of the target language version with the other and with the original one, was done to ensure conceptual agreement. The quality control was done by the IRCAB Foundation (Udine, Italy).

THE SAMPLE

The final version of the SHF was administered with MLHF [10] to a sample of 50 consecutive patients belonging to the heart failure outpatient clinic.

This is a tertiary care clinic and patients belong to all socioeconomic and cultural background.

Tab. I. Patients' descriptive statisti	CS.
Patients char	acteristics
Age	63 (56; 69)*
Gender:	
Males	80% (N = 40)
Females	20% (N = 10)
NYHA:**	
I	8% (N = 4)
II	52% (N = 26)
III	40% (N = 20)
EF	30 (23; 35)*
Etiology:	
Ischemic	40% (N = 20)
Valvular	24% (N = 12)
Dilatative	36% (N = 18)
Previous hospitalizations	77% (N = 37)
Therapy:	
Ace inhibitors	88% (N = 44)
Beta blockers	56% (N = 28)
N = number of patients per category	of variables; * = median [quartile,

** New York Heart Association Classification

A functional and therapeutic classification for prescription of physical activity for cardiac patients.

Class I: patients with no limitation of activities; they suffer no symptoms from ordinary activities.

Class II: patients with slight, mild limitation of activity; they are comfortable with rest or with mild exertion.

Class III: patients with marked limitation of activity; they are comfortable only at rest.

Class IV: patients who should be at complete rest, confined to bed or chair, any physical activity brings on discomfort and symptoms occur at rest.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Data for both SHF and MLHF variables has been transformed to have same range and interpretation, as indicated in Guyatt et al. [11].

Data have been described using appropriate summary statistics (median, first and third quartile for continuous variables and percentages and counts for discrete variables). Spearman's correlation between SHF Overall Summary Score and MLHF has been computed for several subgroups, according to major clinical variables. Difference in SHF and MLHF domains with respect to New York Heart Association Classification (NYHA) levels has been evaluated using a K-independent samples non-parametric median test. Spearman's correlation between each pair of MLHF and SHF domains has been computed.

Significance has been computed at 0.01, 0.05 level. All calculations have been performed using SPSS 7.0.

Results

See appendix 1 for the Italian version of the SHF. Patients characteristic are summarized in Table I. The median age was 63 years. There were 40 men (80%) and 10 women (20%). Only 8% of the patients was in NY-HA class I whereas 52% of the patients were in NYHA class II (26 pts) and 40% in NYHA class III (20 pts). The median EF (left ventricular ejection fraction) was 30%. The etiology was ischemic in 40% of cases, dilatative in 36% of cases, and valvular in 24%. The majority of patients had a previous hospitalization in the last year (77%). Ace inhibitors therapy was administered in 88% of cases and betablockers in 56% of cases.

The Italian version of SHF correlates well with MLHF for all domains, except life satisfaction SHF domain (Tab. II).

Moreover SHF takes into account the changes in different NYHA class. The distribution of SHF "life satisfaction" and "single item" domains are the only equal regarding to the NYHA I-II and NYHA III variables, as shown in Table III.

Finally, Table IV highlights the negative correlation between SHF "life satisfaction" domain and MLHF domains, being positive otherwise.

Discussion

This study reports the Italian translation and validation of the SHF that is a specific disease health related quality-of-life instrument with a well documented validity, reliability and responsiveness [12]. The questionnaire quantifies symptoms, physical limitations, social functioning, patient's sense of self efficacy and quality of life. The main characteristic of the SHF with respect to other instruments to evaluate QoL is the usage of the semantic differential to quantify patients' responses. Each patient has to tick on a line his/her position between two extreme situations (worse, optimal). In the

C. SCARINZI ET AL.

Section Sect	Tab. II. Spearman's correlation between SHF overall summary score and	rrelation between SH	F overall summary scc	≥	MLHF, with respect to the major clinical variables.	al variables.			
Fraction 4.30 8151, 500 7344, 838 6185, 930 7354, 648, 830 7354, 7155, 949 7354, 648, 830 7354, 7155, 949 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 715, 930 7354, 7200 7354, 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300 7354, 7300				COLLIDALISO	ו מפנושפנו אנשומשות	a loos pazil			
President Application Ap			MLHF	SHF	Correlation	SHF ² Emotions	correlation	SHF ²	Correlation
Pranction e 30 87 (e4, 91) 73 (e4, 93) 0.795 77 (55, 91) 0.644 40 (e4) (e3) (e4) 40 (e4) (e4) (e4) (e4) (e4) (e4) (e4) (e4)				Symptoms				Satisfaction	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Ejection Fraction	≥ 30	81 (51, 90)	73 (47, 88)	0.795	77 (55, 91)	0.644	49 (40, 54)	-0.328
High 10,000,000 10,000		> 30	87 (64, 91)	73 (46, 93)	0.802	(47,	0.758	44 (38, 56)	0.165
III 73 47 81 91 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92	NYHA	=	90 (70, 92)	85 (56, 94)	0.621	81 (62, 92)	0.628	47 (38, 64)	-0.316
γ Sichlenic 84 (60, 90) 75 (47, 90) 0.739 81 (63, 59) 0.645 44 (25, 64) Male BC (63, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (46, 90) 77 (47, 90) 77		≡	73 (47, 81)	73 (47, 92)	0.688	67 (38, 71)	0.499	47 (42, 50)	0.194
Maile	Etiology	Ischemic	84 (60, 90)	75 (47, 90)	0.739	(63,	0.645	49 (42, 54)	-0.277
Maile 81 (6) 90 73 (4) 94 0810 72 (55, 87) 0.689 46 (39, 50) Maile 81 (4) 91 73 (4) 92 0.894 73 (4) 93 0.895 46 (39, 50) Fernale 81 (4) 91 73 (4, 42) 73 (4, 42) 0.896 73 (4, 53) 0.000 77 (51, 100) Inchances No 81 (4, 91) 73 (54, 35) 0.722 81 (5, 91) 0.663 77 (51, 100) Inchances No 81 (4, 91) 73 (54, 35) 0.722 81 (5, 91) 0.653 77 (51, 100) Inchances No 81 (4, 7) 73 (56, 81) 73 (56, 81) 0.722 81 (53, 92) 0.673 73 (53, 94) Inchances 87 (60, 90) 73 (46, 94) 73 (56, 81) 0.722 81 (53, 92) 0.673 44 (42, 92) Inchances 87 (61, 90) 73 (56, 81) 73 (56, 81) 0.722 81 (53, 92) 0.673 44 (42, 92) Inchances 87 (61, 90) 73 (46, 94) 73 (46, 94) 0.724 73 (53, 94) Inchances 87 (61, 90) 73 (46, 94) 73 (46, 94) 0.724 73 (56, 94) Inchances 87 (61, 90) 73 (46, 94) 73 (46, 94) 73 (46, 94) 73 (46, 94) Inchances 83 (61, 90) 83 (45, 74) 0.894 83 (40, 80) 0.605 83 (40, 80) Inchances 83 (60, 90) 83 (46, 74) 0.894 83 (40, 80) 0.605 83 (40, 80) Inchances 83 (60, 90) 83 (46, 74) 0.894 83 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 83 (60, 90) 83 (46, 74) 0.894 83 (40, 80) 0.604 80 (40, 80) Inchances 83 (60, 90) 83 (46, 74) 0.895 80 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 83 (60, 90) 83 (46, 74) 0.895 80 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 83 (60, 90) 83 (46, 74) 0.896 80 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 84 (60, 90) 83 (46, 74) 0.896 80 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 87 (40, 74) 0.706 80 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 87 (40, 74) 0.706 80 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 87 (40, 74) 0.706 80 (40, 80) 0.604 Inchances 87 (40, 74) 0.706 0.707 0.706 0.407 Inchances 87 (40, 74) 0.706 0.707 0.706 0.407 Inchances 87 (40, 74) 0.706 0.707 0.706 0.707 0.706 Inchances 87 (40, 74) 0.706 0.707 0.706 0.707 0.706 Inchances 87 (40, 74)		Valvular	82 (43, 92)	73 (51, 92)	0.845	70 (30, 95)	0.778	50 (25, 64)	0.017
Maile 87 (48, 90) 73 (47, 92) 0.000 72 (45, 90) 0.000 77 (51, 100)		Dilatative	85 (60, 90)	73 (46, 94)	0.810	72 (55, 87)	0.688	46 (39, 50)	-0.132
Female Female Famile F	Gender	Male	82 (48, 90)	73 (47, 92)	0.804	73 (54, 90)	0.825	46 (38, 50)	-0.065
Dictors Yes 87 (64, 91) 77 (54, 93) 0,748 74 (56, 91) 0,663 47 (58, 54) Contact Yes 87 (64, 91) 77 (43, 93) 0,722 80 (65, 93) 0,503 50 (39, 78) Contact Yes 87 (64, 91) 77 (43, 93) 0,722 80 (65, 93) 0,673 48 (42, 78) Sable		Female	87 (78, 92)	76 (44, 82)	969.0	78 (42, 90)	0.000	77 (51, 100)	-0.709
No 28 (37, 78) 39 (20, 66) 1,000 20 (9, 79) 0,500 50 (93, 78) Society No 28 (37, 78) 39 (20, 66) 1,000 20 (9, 79) 0,500 50 (39, 78) Society No 28 (37, 79) 73 (46, 94) 0,724 26 (55, 92) 0,673 44 (23, 50) Itaations 2 1 71 (45, 88) 73 (46, 94) 0,724 76 (53, 89) 0,677 44 (23, 50) Itaations 2 1 71 (45, 88) 73 (46, 94) 0,724 76 (53, 99) 0,703 44 (23, 50) Itaations 2 1 71 (45, 88) 73 (46, 94) 0,724 76 (53, 99) 0,703 44 (23, 50) Itaations 2 1 71 (45, 94) 73 (46, 94)	Ace inhibitors	Yes	87 (64, 91)	77 (54, 93)	0.748	74 (56, 91)	0.663	47 (38, 54)	-0.055
Secretary Vess (87 (60, 90) 77 (47, 93) 0.722 (80 (65, 92) 0.628 48 (42, 78) (91 (91 (91 (91 (91 (91 (91 (91 (91 (91		N _O	38 (31, 78)	39 (20, 66)	1.000	20 (9, 79)	0.500	50 (39, 78)	-0.500
No 81 (47,91) 71 (46, 68) 0.854 68 (45, 83) 0.877 42(25, 50) Izations No 81 (47,91) 73 (46, 98) 0.772 76 (58, 99) 0.773 42 (42, 50) Izations × 71 (65, 83) 73 (46, 99) 0.783 74 (45, 90) 0.703 47 (35, 54) Izations × 71 (65, 83) 73 (46, 99) 0.783 74 (46, 90) 0.703 47 (39, 54) Izations × 1	Beta blockers	Yes	87 (60, 90)	77 (47, 93)	0.722	80 (65, 92)	0.628	48 (42, 78)	-0.357
Inations No No 87 (47, 91) 75 (65, 86) 0.727 76 (55, 89) 0.677 42 (35, 54) Inations \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$		N _O	81 (47, 91)	71 (46, 86)	0.854	68 (45, 83)	0.816	44 (29, 50)	0.183
	Previous	9 N	87 (47, 91)	73 (56, 86)	0.727	76 (53, 89)	0.677	42 (33, 54)	-0.117
Section Sect	hospitalizations	VI	71 (56, 83)		0.794	72 (55, 92)	0.773	48 (40, 54)	0.161
Comparison in tanslation), * = median II quartile] Comparison between standardized score* MLHF¹ SHF² Correlation SHF² Physical Sungle Symptoms Litem Namedian SHF² Correlation SHF² Physical Single Symptoms Single Symptoms Single Symptoms Single Symptoms Single Symptoms Single Single Name Single Single Single Single Name Single	Overall		85 (51, 90)	73 (47, 92)	0.783	74 (54, 90)	0.703	47 (39, 54)	-0.117
Compartison between standardized score* NLHF1 SHF2 SHF2 SHF2 SINGE Correlation SINGE SHF2 SINGE Physical Symptoms Symptoms Item N Fraction ≤ 30 81 (51, 90) 57 (46, 71) 0.500 60 (40, 80) N Fraction ≤ 30 81 (51, 90) 57 (46, 71) 0.501 60 (40, 80) N Fraction ≤ 30 87 (64, 91) 69 (57, 77) 0.521 60 (40, 80) N I II 73 (47, 81) 49 (40, 60) 69 (46, 77) 0.627 40 (40, 60) N Valvular 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) N Shibitors Yes 87 (78, 92) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) N Male 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) No 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (47, 91) <td>¹ Minnesota Living with ¹</td> <td>leart Failure; ² Severe l</td> <td>Heart Failure Questionna</td> <td>*</td> <td>= median [quartile, q</td> <td>uartile]</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	¹ Minnesota Living with ¹	leart Failure; ² Severe l	Heart Failure Questionna	*	= median [quartile, q	uartile]			
NLHF¹ SHF² Correlation SHF² Item NFaction ≤ 30 81 (51, 90) 57 (46, 71) 0.500 60 (40, 80) NFaction ≤ 30 81 (51, 90) 57 (46, 71) 0.500 60 (40, 80) NF Faction ≤ 30 81 (64, 91) 69 (57, 77) 0.551 60 (40, 80) NF Faction 1 1 73 (47, 81) 49 (40, 60) 0.554 40 (40, 80) NF Faction 82 (60, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) NA Juliative 85 (60, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) Pemale 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) No 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 40 (20, 60) No 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40				Comparisor	between standard	lized score*			
Physical Symptoms Single Item N Fraction ≤ 30 81 (51, 90) 57 (46, 71) 0.500 60 (40, 80) N Fraction ≤ 30 81 (51, 90) 57 (46, 71) 0.500 60 (40, 80) N Fraction ≤ 30 87 (64, 91) 69 (57, 77) 0.571 60 (40, 80) N III 73 (47, 81) 49 (40, 60) 0.534 40 (40, 60) N Valvular 82 (46, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.637 60 (40, 80) N Valvular 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) Nale 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) Nale 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.620 40 (20, 60) No 87 (48, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (44, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) No 87 (47, 91)			MLHF1	SHF ²	Correlation	SHF ²	Correlation		
n Fraction ≤ 30 81 (51, 90) 57 (46, 71) 0.500 60 (40, 80) I 90 (70, 92) 71 (57, 77) 0.871 60 (40, 80) I 73 (47, 81) 49 (40, 60) 0.554 60 (40, 80) I 73 (47, 81) 49 (40, 60) 0.554 40 (40, 60) I 73 (47, 81) 49 (40, 60) 0.554 40 (40, 60) Valvular 82 (43, 92) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) I 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) I 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) I 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) I 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) I 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.600 60 (40, 80) I 83 (31, 78) 43 (26, 57) 0.600 60 (40, 80) I 85 (50, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.667 60 (40, 80) I 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.709 60 (40, 80) I 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) I 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) I 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) I 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) I 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 10 (40, 80) I 90 (70, 80) 10 (40, 80) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				Physical Symptoms		Single Item			
> 50 87 (64, 91) 69 (57, 77) 0.871 60 (40, 80) III 90 (70, 92) 71 (57, 77) 0.551 60 (40, 80) III 73 (47, 81) 49 (40, 60) 0.554 40 (40, 60) IV Ischemic 84 (60, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.607 60 (40, 80) Valvular 82 (43, 92) 63 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) Pemale 85 (60, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) Pemale 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.139 70 (40, 80) Ibitors Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) Ockers Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.600 60 (40, 80) Ibitors Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.602 60 (40, 80) Ockers Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.602 60 (40, 80) Is No 81 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.602 60 (40, 80) Is No 87 (47, 91) <td< td=""><td>Ejection Fraction</td><td>≥ 30</td><td>81 (51, 90)</td><td>57 (46, 71)</td><td>0.500</td><td>60 (40, 80)</td><td>0.405</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Ejection Fraction	≥ 30	81 (51, 90)	57 (46, 71)	0.500	60 (40, 80)	0.405		
I-II 90 (70, 92)	•	> 30	87 (64, 91)	(69 (57, 77)	0.871	60 (40, 80)	0.605		
III	NYHA	Ξ	90 (70, 92)	71 (57, 77)	0.551	60 (40, 80)	0.397		
yy Ischemic 84 (60, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.607 60 (40, 80) Valvular 82 (43, 92) 63 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 60) Male 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 60) Female 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) ves 87 (48, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 40 (20, 60) No 38 (31, 78) 43 (26, 57) 0.600 60 (40, 80) ockers Yes 87 (60, 90) 69 (49, 77) 0.667 60 (40, 80) Initiations No 81 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) st No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) st 1 (56, 83) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) st 1 (56, 83) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) st 1 (56, 83) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) st 1 (56, 83) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) <td></td> <td>=</td> <td>73 (47, 81)</td> <td>49 (40, 60)</td> <td>0.534</td> <td>40 (40, 60)</td> <td>0.550</td> <td></td> <td></td>		=	73 (47, 81)	49 (40, 60)	0.534	40 (40, 60)	0.550		
Valvular 82 (43, 92) 63 (46, 71) 0.896 80 (20, 80) Dilatative 85 (60, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 60) Pemale 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 80) Ibitors Yes 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.139 70 (40, 80) No 38 (31, 78) 43 (26, 57) 0.600 60 (40, 80) ockers Yes 87 (60, 90) 69 (49, 77) 0.667 60 (40, 80) Is No 81 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) Is No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) Is 17 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) sct Living with Heart Failure; 2 Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile. III quartile. 60 (40, 80)	Etiology	Ischemic	84 (60, 90)	69 (46, 77)	0.607		0.365		
Pilatative 85 (60, 90) 69 (46, 77) 0.689 60 (40, 60) Male 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.812 60 (40, 80) Female 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.139 70 (40, 80) No 38 (54, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 40 (20, 60) ockers Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.602 60 (40, 80) ockers Yes 87 (60, 90) 69 (49, 77) 0.667 60 (40, 80) s No 81 (47, 91) 57 (43, 71) 0.667 60 (40, 80) s No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) silizations ≥ 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) sch Living with Heart Failure; 2 Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile. III quartile. 60 (40, 80)		Valvular	82 (43, 92)	63 (46, 71)	0.896		0.643		
Female 82 (48, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.812 60 (40, 80) Female 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.139 70 (40, 80) libitors Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 40 (20, 60) ockers Yes 87 (60, 90) 69 (49, 77) 0.623 60 (40, 80) lockers No 81 (47, 91) 57 (43, 71) 0.667 60 (40, 80) s. No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) lizations ≥ 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) s. Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile. III quartile.		Dilatative	85 (60, 90)	69 (46, 77)	0.689		0.524		
Female 87 (78, 92) 59 (40, 77) 0.139 70 (40, 80) 16itors Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 40 (20, 60) 60 (40, 80) 60 (42, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 60 (40, 80) 60 (40, 80) 60 (42, 91) 69 (49, 77) 0.607 60 (40, 80)	Gender	Male	82 (48, 90)	69 (46, 76)	0.812		0.647		
ibitions Yes 87 (64, 91) 69 (46, 77) 0.620 40 (20, 60) No 58 (31, 78) 43 (26, 57) 0.600 60 (40, 80) ockers Yes 87 (60, 90) 69 (49, 77) 0.623 60 (40, 80) No 81 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.667 60 (40, 80) silizations ≥ 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.208 60 (40, 80) social Living with Heart Failure, 2 Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile. III quartile.		Female	87 (78, 92)	59 (40, 77)	0.139	70 (40, 80)	-0.086		
No 38 (31, 78) 43 (26, 57) 0.600 60 (40, 80) ockers Yes 87 (60, 90) 69 (49, 77) 0.623 60 (40, 80) Is No 81 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.667 60 (40, 80) silizations ≥ 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) sota Living with Heart Failure, 2 Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile. III quartile.	Ace inhibitors	Yes	87 (64, 91)	69 (46, 77)	0.620		0.417		
ockers Yes 87 (60, 90) 69 (49, 77) 0.623 60 (40, 80) Incompanies No 81 (47, 91) 57 (43, 71) 0.667 60 (40, 80) Instations No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) Instations > 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) Set 51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) Sockere Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile. III quartile. 60 (40, 80)		No	38 (31, 78)	43 (26, 57)	0.600		0.638		
LS No 81 (47, 91) 57 (43, 71) 0.667 60 (40, 80) as No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) e1 (40, 80) ≈ 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) ≈ 1 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) e1 Living with Heart Failure, 2 Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile, III quartile	Beta blockers	Yes	87 (60, 90)	69 (49, 77)	0.623		0.575		
us No 87 (47, 91) 70 (60, 77) 0.709 60 (40, 80) Allizations ≥ 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) R5 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) sota Living with Heart Failure, 2 Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile, III quartile.		No	81 (47, 91)	57 (43, 71)	0.667		0.415		
Alizations 2 1 71 (56, 83) 69 (46, 74) 0.208 60 (40, 80) 85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) sota Living with Heart Failure; 2 Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile; III quartile: * = mediana II quartile:	Previous	No	87 (47, 91)	70 (60, 77)	0.709		0.474		
85 (51, 90) 69 (46, 76) 0.673 60 (40, 80) cota Living with Heart Failure, ² Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile, III quartile1	hospitalizations	VI	71 (56, 83)	69 (46, 74)	0.208		0.127		
¹ Minnesota Living with Heart Failure; ² Severe Heart Failure Questionnaire; * = mediana II quartile, III quartile]	Overall		85 (51, 90)	9 (46,	0.673	(40,	0.501		
	¹ Minnesota Living with F	leart Failure; ² Severe F	Heart Failure Questionns	aire; * = mediana II quarti	le, III quartile]				

	NYHA I-II (N = 30)	NYHA III * (N = 19)	Overall * (N = 49)	P-value
Minnesota Living with Heart Fail	ure			
Minnesota Emotional Score	92 (72, 100)	76 (68, 92)	88 (72, 96)	0.037
Minnesota Physical Score	92 (70, 97)	67 (35, 75)	82 (47, 95)	0.004
Minnesota Total Score	90 (70, 92)	73 (47, 81)	85 (51, 90)	< 0.001
Severe Heart Failure Questionna	ire			
SHF Somatic Symptoms	85 (56, 94)	57 (30, 69)	73 (47, 92)	0.002
SHF Emotions	81 (62, 92)	67 (38, 71)	73 (54, 90)	0.002
SHF Life Satisfaction	47 (38, 64)	47 (42, 50)	47 (39, 54)	0.910
SHF Physical Symptoms	71 (57, 77)	49 (40, 60)	69 (46, 76)	0.002
SHF Single Item	60 (40, 80)	60 (40, 80)	60 (40, 80)	0.178

		Min	nesota Living with Heart Fai	lure
		Minnesota Emotional Score	Minnesota Physical Score	Minnesota Total Score
-	SHF Somatic Symptoms	0.551*	0.641*	0.587*
ga Ç	SHF Emotions	0.569*	0.559*	0.509*
ere He Failure	SHF Life Satisfaction	-0.155	-0.110	-0.085
Severe Heart Failure	SHF Physical Symptoms	0.384*	0.578*	0.547*
Se (SHF Single Item	0.450*	0.418*	0.416*

original work the SHF is more sensitive to the important clinical change in the responsiveness cohort of patients than the MLHF or the SF-36 (Short-Form - 36 questions). The increased sensitivity to clinical change is summarized by the responsiveness statistics: the SHF physical limitation scale's responsiveness is three times larger that the corresponding domains of the MLHF and SF-36. Some authors have noted that MLHF is sensitive to differentiates in symptom severity except in the most compromised patients group.

As reported by Green et al. [13], problems of meaning and interpretation could occur when respondents answer items of questionnaire. Respondents might fail to understand a concept and thus give widely different interpretations to it. In particular, problem can arise with items that

contain questions separated by the word 'or' and items that are considered not applicable to the respondent's circumstances. Furthermore, the translation from English to other languages may result in a certain loss of concision, making questionnaire items more complex to understand. In spite of these potential drawbacks, the Italian version of the SHF correlates well with MLHF for almost all domains. The two questionnaires also correlate well for EF, NYHA class, etiology, therapy and hospitalization.

Both the SHF and MLHF appear to be valid and reliable, however the SHF has the important advantage to avoid the patient to constrains his/her evaluation of the perceived quality of life into a 5 or 7 point Likert Scale. In this sense, the semantic differential used in the SHF is most appealing to limit cognitive biases in the patients' indications.

References

- [1] Cowie SA, Wood DA, Coats AJ, Thompson SG, Poole-Wilson PA, et al. Value of natriuretic peptides in assessment of patients with possible new heart failure in primary care. Lancet 1997;350:1349-53.
- [2] Gorkin L, Follick MJ, Geltman E, Hamm P, Sollano J, Sylvia S, et al. *Quality of Life among patients post-myocardial infarction at baseline in the Survival and Ventricular Enlargement (SAVE) trial.* Qual Life Res 1994;3:111-9.
- [3] Konstam VSD, Pouleur H, Kostis J. Baseline quality of life as a predictor of mortality and hospitalization in 5025 patients with congestive heart failure. SOLVD Investigations. Studies of Left Ventricular Dysfunction Investigators. Am J Cardiol 1996;78:890-5.
- [4] Martensson J, Dracup K, Canary C, Fridlund B. Living with heart failure: depression and quality of life in patients and spounses. J Hearth Lung Transplant 2003;22:460-7.
- [5] Andresen EM, Meyers AR. *Health-related quality of life outcomes measures*. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2000;81(Suppl 2):S30-45.

C. SCARINZI ET AL.

- [6] Guyatt GH. Measurement of health-related quality of life in heart failure. J Am Coll Cardiol 1993;22(Suppl A):185A-191A.
- [7] Berry C, McMurray J. A review of quality-of-life evaluations in patients with congestive heart failure. Pharmacoeconomics 1999;16:247-71.
- [8] The SOLVD Investigators. Effect of enalapril on mortality and the development of heart failure in asymptomatic patients with reduced left ventricular ejection fractions. N Engl J Med 1992;327:685-91.
- [9] Wiklund I, Lindvall K, Swedberg K, Zupkis RV. Self-assessment of quality of life in severe heart failure. An instrument for clinical use. Scand J Psychol 1987;28:220-5.
- [10]Rector TS, Kubo SH, Cohn JN. Patients' self-assessment of their congestive heart failure: Content, reliability, and validity of a new measure, the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire. Heart Failure 1987;3:198-209.
- [11]Guyatt G, Feeny D, Patrick D. *Issues in quality-of-life measurement in clinical trials*. Control Clin Trials 1991;12(Suppl 4):81S-90S.
- [12]Green C, Brazier J, Deverill M. Valuing health-related quality of life. A review of health state valuation techniques. Pharmaeconomics 2000;17:151-65.
- [13]Hak T, Willems D, van der Wal G, Visser F. A qualitative validation of the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire. Qual Life Res 2004;13:417-26.

Appendix 1: SHF Italian version

La preghiamo di indicare con una X il punto nella scala sottostante che indica il suo stato di salute durante l'ultima set	La 1	preghiamo	di indicare co	on una X il r	unto nella sc	cala sottostante	che	indica	il suo st	tato di	salute	durante	l'ultima	settin	nana
--	------	-----------	----------------	---------------	---------------	------------------	-----	--------	-----------	---------	--------	---------	----------	--------	------

Esempio: molto per niente

Il dolore al torace ha limitato le sue attività giornaliere?

Le è mancato il respiro durante la notte?

Si è sentito affaticato?

Si è sentito esausto?

Si è sentito debole?

Si è sentito pigro?

Nel complesso, come le è sembrato il suo stato di salute nell'ultima settimana?

Ha avuto delle difficoltà nel prendere delle decisioni?

Si è sentito nervoso o preoccupato?

Si è sentito depresso?

Si è sentito agitato?

Ha avuto difficoltà a rilassarsi?

Si è sentito suscettibile?

Si è sentito più sensibile ai rumori (o alla confusione)?

Si è sentito soddisfatto della sua vita?

Si è sentito pessimista?

Ha trovato che la sua esistenza ha un significato?

Si è sentito di buon umore?

Si è sentito soddisfatto?

Di seguito troverà una serie di domande relative alle attività quotidiane. La preghiamo di indicare con una crocetta la risposta che corrisponde alla Sua situazione. Può scegliere solo una delle possibili risposte. La preghiamo di risondere a tutte le domande.

Esempio: senza difficoltà <u>×</u> quasi senza difficoltà _ con qualche difficoltà _ _

con parecchia difficoltà
è stato impossibile

È stato in grado di uscire durante l'ultima settimana?

Durante l'ultima settimana, è stato in grado di scendere e salire le scale (circa 8 gradini)?

È stato in grado di camminare in salita ed in discesa durante l'ultima settimana?

È stato in grado di muoversi in casa durante l'ultima settimana?

È stato in grado di uscire per fare una passeggiata (meno di 1 km) durante l'ultima settimana?

È stato in grado di stare all'aperto durante l'ultima settimana?

È stato in grado di fare le faccende di casa (spolverare, cucinare, cambiare le lampadine ecc.) durante l'ultima settimana?

156

Con quante difficoltà il suo stato di salute è migliorato dopo aver iniziato la terapia?

Minnesota Living with Heart Failure® Questionnaire

The following questions ask how much your heart failure (heart condition) affected your life during the past month (4 weeks). After each question, circle the 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 to show how much your life was affected. If a question does not apply to you, circle the 0 after that question.

	your heart failure prevent you from living as you wanted ing the pat month (4 weeks) by:	No	Very little				Very much
1.	causing swelling in your ankles or legs?	0	1	2	3	4	5
2.	making you sit or lie down to rest during the day?	0	1	2	3	4	5
3.	making your walking about or climbing stairs difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
4.	making your working around the house or yard difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.	making your going places away from home difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.	making your sleeping well at night difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
7.	making your relating to or doing things with your friends or family difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
8.	making your working to earn a living difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	making your recreational pastimes, sports or hobbies difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
10.	making your sexual activities difficult?	0	1	2	3	4	5
11.	making you eat less of the foods you like?	0	1	2	3	4	5
12.	making you short of breath?	0	1	2	3	4	5
13.	making you tired, fatigued, or low on energy?	0	1	2	3	4	5
14.	making you stay in a hospital?	0	1	2	3	4	5
15.	costing you money for medical care?	0	1	2	3	4	5
16.	giving you side effects from treatments?	0	1	2	3	4	5
17.	making you feel you are a burden to your family or friends?	0	1	2	3	4	5
18.	making you feel a loss of self-control in your life?	0	1	2	3	4	5
19.	making you worry?	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.	making it difficult for you to concentrate or remember things?	0	1	2	3	4	5
21.	making you feel depressed?	0	1	2	3	4	5

© 1986 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. Reproduced with permission. LIVING WITH HEART FAILURE® is a registered trademark of the Regents of the University of Minnesota. 11/10/04

[■] Received on January 3, 2008. Accepted on August 29, 2008.

[■] Correspondence: Prof. Dario Gregori, University of Turin, Department of Public Health and Microbiology, via Santena 5bis, 10126 Torino, Italy - Tel. +39 011 6705813 - Fax +39 011 2365813 - E-mail: dario.gregori@unito.it