

The Official Journal of the Mexican Association of Hepatology, the Latin-American Association for Study of the Liver and the Canadian Association for the Study of the Liver

Cultural validation of the post-Liver transplant quality of life (pLTQ) questionnaire for the Brazilian population

Cibele Molski,*," Rita Mattiello,†," Edgar E. Sarria,‡ Sammy Saab,§ Renata Medeiros,* Ajacio Brandão*, I

* Postgraduate Program in Medicine: Hepatology, School of Medicine,
Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre (UFCSPA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

† Institute of Biomedical Research, Centro Infant, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

‡ School of Medicine, Universidade de Santa Cruz (UNISC), Santa Cruz, RS, Brazil.

§ Department of Medicine and Surgery, David Geffen School of Medicine, Los Angeles, United States.

|| Liver Transplantation Group, Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

"The first two authors (Cibele Molski and Rita Mattiello) contributed equally to the study.

ABSTRACT

Background and rationale. The post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life (pLTQ) questionnaire, developed in the United States, is a disease-targeted instrument designed to evaluate health-related quality of life (HRQoL) in liver transplant recipients. Our study sought to validate a version of the pLTQ for use in the Brazilian population. Translation and cross-cultural adaptation were carried out in accordance with international standard practices for questionnaire validation. Validity was measured by means of convergent validity (correlations between pLTQ domains and WHOQOL-Bref domains). Reliability was assessed by measurement of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha coefficient), reproducibility (intraclass correlation coefficient), sensitivity to change (effect size), and floor and ceiling effects. **Results.** The study sample comprised 160 liver transplant recipients, with a mean age of 56.9 ± 10.4 years, treated at a tertiary hospital in Southern Brazil. The sample was largely male (62.5%), and the predominant indication for liver transplant was hepatocellular carcinoma (49.4%). Only two questionnaire items were modified during the translation and cross-cultural validation stage. The mean total pLTQ score was 5.58 ± 0.9 , with < 20% floor/ceiling effect. Correlations between pLTQ and WHOQOL-Bref domains were acceptable (r = 0.37 - 0.40). For similar dimensions, the correlations between WHOQOL-Bref and pLTQ were statistically significant ($p \le 0.001$). Cronbach's alpha for the total score was 0.91 (95% CI 0.89 - 0.93), with a range of 0.51 to 0.77 across domains. Reproducibility was 0.90, and sensitivity to change was 0.84. **Conclusion.** In conclusion, the Brazilian Portuguese version of the pLTQ exhibited good psychometric performance, suggesting that it can be a useful tool in the Brazilian cultural context.

Key words. Validation studies. Patient outcomes assessment. Outcome measure.

INTRODUCTION

Liver transplantation (LTx) is the preferred treatment modality for patients with end-stage liver disease. Approximately 2,500 LTx procedures are performed every year in Latin America. In Brazil, 1,700 LTx were performed in 2013. With improved outcomes the population of liver transplant recipients is growing worldwide. However, it should be taken into account that patients who undergo LTx require permanent care, largely due to clinical complications that usually occur after the procedure. As survival and other clinical aspects related to LTx have improved substantially, the focus of care has shifted

to also include quality of life (QoL),^{6,7} defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as "state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease and infirmity", and, particularly, on health-related quality of life (HRQoL),⁸ which describes the repercussions of disease and its treatment on the lifestyle, mental balance, and well-being of patients, according to their own judgments and perceptions.

Systematic reviews and meta-analysis of studies that evaluated HRQoL in liver transplant recipients by means of generic questionnaires have shown that, in general, LTx improves HRQoL.⁹⁻¹¹ However, until recently, no specific instrument was available for assessment of HRQoL in

Manuscript received: June 14, 2015. Manuscript accepted: August 28, 2015.

liver transplant recipients. To bridge this gap, the U.S. group of Saab, *et al.* developed the post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life (pLTQ) questionnaire. ¹² The pLTQ is relatively fast and easy to administer.

The applicability of HRQoL measurement instruments is limited by the validity and reliability of each questionnaire in different populations. 11,13 When developed in countries other than the country in which they will be employed, additional validation through a standardized process (translation into the local language and adaptation to the cultural context of the country in question) is essential. 13,14 The objective of the present study was to cross-culturally adapt and validate the pLTQ in Brazilian Portuguese for use in LTx recipients.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Patients

Between September 2012 and January 2013, a convenience sample of LTx recipients aged >18 years and treated at the outpatient clinic of the Liver Transplantation Group at Complexo Hospitalar da Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Brazil, was invited to take part in the study. Patients were excluded from analysis if they had undergone combined liver-kidney transplantation, were receiving treatment for hepatitis C virus infection, or had cognitive limitations that prevented understanding of questionnaire items.

Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were administered to the population of interest: the pLTQ12 (Appendix 1) and the previously validated Brazilian Portuguese version of the WHOQOL-Bref. 15 The pLTQ assesses specific factors that can affect the lives of patients who have undergone LTx, including symptoms, mood, limitation of the activities of daily living, energy level, and transplant-related care. It comprises 32 items, grouped into eight domains: Emotional (four items), Worry (seven items), Medications (four items), Physical Function (six items), Healthcare (four items), Graft Rejection Concern (two items), Financial (two items), and Pain (three items). Items are scored on a seven-point Likert-type scale, where 1 corresponds to "always" and 7 to "never". The pLTQ yields individual scores for each domain as well as a multidimensional total score. 12 The WHOQOL-Bref 16 is a generic QoL assessment questionnaire developed by WHO that comprises 26 items across four domains: Physical Health, Psychological Health, Social Relationships, and Environment.

The questionnaires were administered by means of an interview (test), by two previously trained investigators, when patients attended the clinic for their regularly scheduled appointments. The instruments were readministered (retest) after, on average, 1 month. Alongside pLTQ administration, patients underwent a clinical assessment and completed a Global Rating of Change (GRC) survey. The GRC was designed as a self-assessment of changes in health condition between the first and second administrations of the questionnaire, and consisted of a single question answered on a five-point Likert-type scale.¹⁷ For analysis, the patients were divided into two subgroups: "change" (reported improvement or deterioration between the two visits) and "no change" (did not experience change). This enabled assessment of the sensitivity to change and reproducibility of the pLTQ.

Translation and validation process

The study consisted of two stages: translation of the pLTQ and assessment of its psychometric properties.

Validation

The validation process was conducted in accordance with internationally recommended standard, in the following sequence of stages:¹⁸

- Initial translation: the items of the original Englishlanguage version of the pLTQ were translated (conceptually, not strictly literally) into Brazilian Portuguese by two independent, bilingual health professionals, both of whom were aware of the objective of the study. Differences between the versions produced by each translator were discussed between them and with one of the authors of the original questionnaire to reach a consensus version.
- Back-translation of the consensus version into English by two independent, bilingual translators, both of whom were aware of the objective of the study and neither of whom had been involved in the initial translation. The resulting version was compared with the original and discussed by the translators, with modifications made as necessary to achieve better equivalence.
- Assessment and approval of the resulting versions (Portuguese and English) by the authors of the original instrument.
- Administration of the questionnaire to 10 subjects drawn from the target population, to identify potential barriers to understanding, and implementation of final adjustments in response to the subjects' suggestions.

This led to the inclusion of a parenthetical explanation to improve understanding of one item and to a change in the wording of another (replacing the term *irritadiço*, "cranky", with *irritado*, "upset"). The questionnaire was administered by means of an interview, and patients had no issues choosing their responses.

Assessment of psychometric properties

Assessment of psychometric properties (field validation) was carried out after administration of the resulting version of the pLTQ to LTx recipients receiving outpatient follow-up. The psychometric properties of interest were validity and reliability. The former was evaluated by measurement of convergent validity, assessing whether the pLTQ domains correlated well with the equivalent WHOQOL-Bref domains. The validity of the pLTQ was evaluated by measuring specific correlations (item-total and item-domain). Reliability was assessed by determining:

- Internal consistency, by means of Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficient).
- Sensitivity to change (i.e., whether the instrument was able to identify differences in QoL between interviews), by measuring the effect size (ES).¹⁸
- Reproducibility (i.e., whether the instrument produces similar results, assuming there has been no change in patient condition), by measuring the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), ^{17,19} and
- Ceiling and floor effects.¹⁸

Optimally, these effects should be below 15-20%. ¹⁸ Internal consistency was evaluated in the sample as a whole, but sensitivity and reproducibility were dependent on GRC results. In the "change" subgroup, effect sizes were calculated, whereas in the "no change" subgroup, ICC was calculated instead.

Clinical variables of interest

Data were collected on the following variables: socioe-conomic status, severity of liver disease on the day of LTx, time elapsed between LTx and first interview, and presence of comorbidities. Socioeconomic status was evaluated by means of the Brazilian Economic Classification Criterion, 20 2009 version, which identifies five economic classes (A, B, C, D, E) according to a combination of the following elements: educational attainment of the head of household, ownership of certain material goods, and employing a domestic worker on a monthly basis. The Brazil-validated version of the Model for End-Stage Liver Disease (MELD) severity score²¹ was used to assess the

severity of liver disease at the time of transplantation. The MELD score was calculated using the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS) formula.²² Time (in months) elapsed between transplantation and administration of the questionnaire was stratified as follows: 0 to 6 months; 6 to 12 months; or > 12 months.

The presence or absence of comorbidities was recorded, with particular emphasis on diagnoses of diabetes mellitus, hypertension, osteoporosis, and obesity.

Statistical analysis

The sample size was calculated as 160 participants, taking into account the inclusion of five participants per item of the instrument. The statistical significance level was set at 5%.

Categorical variables were expressed as absolute and relative frequencies, and continuous variables as mean and standard deviation or median and interquartile range as appropriate.

Convergent validity was measured by assessing whether the pLTQ domains correlated well with the equivalent WHOQOL-Bref domains. This was done by means of Spearman correlation coefficients (r), with values > 0.3deemed acceptable. Reliability was tested by means of internal consistency and ceiling and floor effects, which were considered substantial if > 20%. In assessing the internal consistency of the instrument, Cronbach's a values ≥ 0.5 were deemed adequate. Reproducibility, as assessed by the ICC between interviews in the "no change" subgroup, was considered acceptable if ICC \geq 0.60. Sensitivity to change was estimated by calculating the ES of differences between the two interviews in respondents allocated to the "change" subgroup on the basis of GRC results. Effect sizes are classified as small (ES = 0.2), medium (ES = 0.5), or large (ES = 0.8).

Ethical aspects

After written authorization for cross-cultural adaptation and validation had been obtained from the main author of the pLTQ instrument, the study project was submitted to and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Irmandade da Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre. All respondents provided written informed consent for participation at the time of the initial interview.

RESULTS

Overall, 164 patients were eligible for inclusion; of these, four were excluded due to refusal to participate.

The general characteristics of the 160 patients included in the study are shown in table 1.

Most patients (62.5%) were male, and the mean age was 56.7 years (SD, 10.4 years). Approximately 52% of patients had \leq 9 years of formal schooling and 85% were in socioeconomic class C or D. Hepatocellular carcinoma (associated with hepatitis C virus infection in > 60% of patients) was the indication for LTx in half of all cases; in 82% of patients, LTx had been performed > 12 months before study inclusion.

The results of the pLTQ in the study population are shown in table 2. The mean total score was 5.58 ± 0.9 points. The lowest mean score was observed in the Rejection domain (4.7 ± 1.9) , and the highest, in the Financial domain (6.5 ± 0.9) .

Correlations between WHOQOL-Bref and pLTQ scores are shown in table 3. Significant correlations were observed between WHOQOL-Bref and pLTQ scores, both global and domain-specific across their equivalent dimensions, which suggests adequate convergent validity. Indication for transplant, MELD score on the day of LTx, time elapsed between LTx and initial interview, and presence of comorbidities in the postoperative period did not correlate with pLTQ scores.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of liver transplant recipients.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of liver	transplant recipients
Demographic characteristics	n = 160
Age (years), mean ± SD	56.9 ± 10.4
Sex (male), n (%)	100 (62.5)
Educational years, n (%)	100 (02.0)
< 9 years	84 (52.5)
Socioeconomic level, n (%)	
Class A	35 (21.9)
Class B	29 (18.1)
Class C	42 (26.3)
Class D	43 (26.9)
Class E	11 (6.9)
MELD score, mean ± SD	16.3 ± 6.3
Time since transplant	73.5 (25.5-119.7)
(months), median (IQR)	, ,
Time since transplant, stratified, n (%)	
< 6 months	15 (9.4)
6-12 months	14 (8.8)
> 12 months	131 (81.9)
Indication for transplant, n (%)	
Hepatocellular carcinoma	79 (49.4)
Alcoholic cirrhosis	15 (9.4)
Cryptogenic cirrhosis / NAFLD	11 (6.9)
Hepatitis B	8 (5)
Hepatitis C	29 (18.1)
Fulminant hepatitis	3 (1.9)
Other	15 (9.4)

SD: standard deviation. MELD: Model for End-stage Liver Disease. IQR: interquartile range. NAFLD: nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Other: primary sclerosing cholangitis, autoimmune cirrhosis, polycystic liver disease, primary biliary cirrhosis, and liver metastases from neuroendocrine cancer.

Table 2. Characteristics of the post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life (pLTQ) questionnaire in a Brazilian population

				ū	pLTQ Scores Domain				
Variables	Total	Emotional	Worry	Medications	Physical Function	Health	Rejection	Financial	Pain
Items, n Mean ± SD Floor effect, n (%) Ceiling effect, n (%) α-C, mean (95%CI) α-C, mean*	32 5.58 ± 0.9 0 (0) 3 (1.9) 0.91 (0.89-0.93) 0.93	4 5.0 ± 1.2 0 (0) 9 (5.6) 0.69 (0.61-0.76) 0.78	7 5.2 ± 1.2 0 (0) 14 (8.8) 0.77 (0.72-0.82) 0.85	4 6.0 ± 1.0 0 (0) 48 (30) 0.59 (0.48-0.69) 0.70	6 5.4 ± 1.2 0 (0) 12 (7.5) 0.72 (0.64-0.78) 0.79	4 6.3 ± 0.9 0 (0) 56 (35) 0.59 (0.48-0.69) 0.66	2 4.7 ± 1.9 11 (6.9) 39 (24.4) 0.69 (0.58-0) 0.72	2 6.5 ± 0.9 1 (0.6) 118 (73.8) 1-0) 0.51 (0.33-0.64) 0 0.64	3 5.15 ± 1.3 0 (0) 15 (9.4) 0.51 (0.36-0.63) 0.60

pLTC: post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life Questionnaire. «.-C. Cronbach's alpha coefficient. * Data from the original pLTQ publication

Table 3. Correlation between WHOQOL-Bref scores and post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life (pLTQ) questionnaire scores.

		pLTQ score, r (p) Domain		
Variables	Total	Physical Function	Emotional	
WHOQOL-Bref Domain	r (p)	r (p)	r (p)	
Total	0.40 (< 0.001*)		,	
Physical		0.37 (< 0.001*)		
Psychological			0.26 (0.001*)	

pLTQ: post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life. WHOQOL-Bref: World Health Organization Quality of Life assessment, abbreviated. * Pearson correlation.

The pLTQ exhibited good reliability, with a Cronbach's a of 0.91 (0.89-0.93) for the total domain score, and all domains had Cronbach's a coefficients \geq 0.50. Reproducibility and sensitivity to change were also good, with ES = 0.90 (0.74-0.96) and ICC = 0.84 respectively. A floor effect was observed only in the Rejection and Financial domains. However, out of all domains, including the total score, three exhibited a ceiling effect. Cronbach's a coefficients and floor/ceiling effects are shown in table 2.

DISCUSSION

The Brazilian Portuguese version of the pLTQ questionnaire developed in the present study demonstrated validity and reliability for assessment of HRQoL in adult liver transplant recipients in the Brazilian cultural context. The instrument exhibited adequate psychometric performance and total and domain values similar to those obtained with the original version of the instrument, which was validated in a similar population in the United States.

Despite the low socioeconomic level²⁰ of the evaluated population, patients had no trouble understanding the instrument. With a mean response time of 14 min, the questionnaire can easily be administered in a waiting-room setting without taking up too much of the patient's or the interviewer's time.

We observed similarities between our findings and those of Saab, et al. 12 The reliability of the translated version of the questionnaire as estimated by Cronbach' a (0.91) was satisfactory and comparable to that of the original pLTQ (0.93). 16 All domains exhibited acceptable (≥ 0.50) Cronbach' a coefficients, which suggests that, as a whole, the translated version of the questionnaire can be considered a reliable tool for QoL assessment of liver transplant recipients in Brazil. The lowest scores (floor effect) were observed in the Rejection and Financial domains, both of which exhibited lower mean scores in the translated version than in the original instrument. The finding of lower Financial domain scores in our study may be attributed to the Brazilian health system; unlike in the United States, medications required for post-transplant

care are provided free of charge by the Brazilian government. Therefore, in principle, patients would not have to worry about medication-related expenses. Both reproducibility and sensitivity to change were within acceptable range (0.90 and 0.84 respectively).

Significant correlations were observed between the WHOQOL-Bref and the pLTQ, both in overall scores and in corresponding dimensions (Physical and Psychological), thus demonstrating the validity of the instrument in assessing similar aspects of general QoL. However, there are specific concerns pertaining to the liver transplant population that can affect patient QoL and cannot be captured by a generic QoL instrument; these include adverse effects of immunosuppressant drugs, rejection, and ability to afford post-transplant care and follow-up. Therefore, the pLTQ instrument is capable of capturing factors specific to liver transplant recipients, which usually are not addressed by generic questionnaires.¹⁶

Associations between pLTQ score and MELD score on the day of LTx were not significant, nor were potential associations with other variables of interest, such as time elapsed since transplantation, indication for transplant, and presence of comorbidities in the postoperative period. In our cohort, the mean MELD score on the day of LTx was 16.3; this appears to corroborate the findings of Rodrigue, *et al.*, ²³ who found that MELD scores greater than 25 (i.e., indicative of greater disease severity) have a relevant impact on post-LTx QoL.

In the immediate postoperative period of LTx, patients are susceptible to a series of complications, which are mostly associated with the surgical procedure itself, with psychological factors, and with immunosuppressive therapy. The ability to follow changes in the HRQoL of liver transplant recipients from the preoperative period through the immediate postoperative period and in the long term thereafter can contribute to the delivery of more comprehensive care to these patients.²⁴ We expect this validated questionnaire will become an important instrument to clinicians and investigators alike involved in LTx in Brazil. Thus far, there was no disease-specific instrument for assessment and monitoring of HRQoL in liver transplant recipients in the country. This instrument should enable

periodic assessment of this patient population and identification of those patients with the poorest QoL scores, potentially for delivery of distinct or additional support measures.

One limitation of this study is the fact that patients were recruited from a single transplant center in Southern Brazil. Nevertheless, this center has been operational since 1991, has performed over 1,000 liver transplants, and has a satisfactory record of patient and graft survival outcomes.²¹

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Brazilian Portuguese version of the pLTQ questionnaire developed in this study exhibited good psychometric properties. Consequently, the questionnaire was deemed adequate for and applicable to Brazilian liver transplant recipients, regardless of etiology or severity of underlying liver disease. Our findings support the use of the pLTQ instrument, which is now available in Brazilian Portuguese.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ES: effect size.
- GRC: Global Rating of Change.
- **HRQoL:** Health-related quality of life.
- ICC: intraclass correlation coefficient.
- LTx: liver transplantation.
- **MELD:** Model for End-Stage Liver Disease.
- pLTQ: post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

The authors have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the Liver Transplantation Group at Complexo Hospitalar da Irmandade Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, Brazil, for the collaboration in all stages of our research.

REFERENCES

 Dutkowski P, Linecker M, DeOliveira ML, Mullhaupt B, Clavien PA. Challenges to Liver Transplantation and Strategies to Improve Outcomes. Gastroenterology 2015; 148: 307-23.

- Salvalaggio PR, Caicedo JC, de Albuquerque LC, Contreras A, Garcia VD, Felga GE, Maurette RJ, et al. Liver transplantation in Latin America: the state-of-the-art and future trends. *Transplantation* 2014; 98: 241-6.
- Associação Brasileira de Transplante de Órgãos. Dimensionamento dos transplantes no Brasil e em cada estado (2006-2013). Registro Brasileiro de Transplantes 2013; 4: 1-95
- Harrison JD, Kim A, Al-Ali S, Morton RP. Postmortem investigation of mylohyoid hiatus and hernia: aetiological factors of plunging ranula. Clin Anat 2013; 26: 693-9.
- Singh S, Watt KD. Long-term medical management of the liver transplant recipient: what the primary care physician needs to know. Mayo Clin Proc 2012; 87: 779-90.
- Yao G, Chung CW, Yu CF, Wang JD. Development and verification of validity and reliability of the WHOQOL-BREF Taiwan version. J Formos Med Assoc 2002; 101: 342-51.
- Hofhuis JG, Spronk PE. Quality of Life after Critical Illness. Textbook of Post-ICU Medicine: the Legacy of Critical Care. 2014, p. 82.
- Guyatt GH, Feeny DH, Patrick DL. Measuring health-related quality of life. Ann Intern Med 1993; 118: 622-9.
- Sullivan KM, Radosevich DM, Lake JR. Health-related quality of life: two decades after liver transplantation. *Liver Transpl* 2014; 20: 649-54.
- Bravata DM, Olkin I, Barnato AE, Keeffe EB, Owens DK. Health-related quality of life after liver transplantation: a meta-analysis. *Liver Transpl Surg* 1999; 5: 318-31.
- Younossi ZM, Guyatt G, Kiwi M, Boparai N, King D. Development of a disease specific questionnaire to measure health related quality of life in patients with chronic liver disease. *Gut* 1999; 45: 295-300.
- Saab S, Ng V, Landaverde C, Lee SJ, Comulada WS, Arevalo J, Durazo F, et al. Development of a disease-specific questionnaire to measure health-related quality of life in liver transplant recipients. *Liver Transpl* 2011; 17: 567-79.
- Herdman M, Fox-Rushby J, Badia X. 'Equivalence' and the translation and adaptation of health-related quality of life questionnaires. Qual Life Res 1997; 6: 237-47.
- Acquadro C, Conway K, Hareendran A, Aaronson N. Literature review of methods to translate health-related quality of life questionnaires for use in multinational clinical trials. Value Health 2008; 11: 509-21.
- Fleck MPA, Louzada S, Xavier M, Chachamovich E, Vieira G, Santos L, Pinzon V. Aplicação da versão em português do instrumento abreviado de avaliação da qualidade de vida "WHOQOL-bref". Rev Saúde Pública 2000; 34: 178-83.
- Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. The WHOQOL Group. Psychol Med 1998; 28: 551-8.
- Sarria EE, Rosa RC, Fischer GB, Hirakata VN, Rocha NS, Mattiello R. Field-test validation of the Brazilian version of the Paediatric Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire. *J Bras Pneumol* 2010: 36: 417-24.
- Streiner DL, Norman GR. Norman GR. Health measurement scales: a practical guide to their development and use. Oxford university press; 2008.
- Fayers P, Machin D. Quality of life: the assessment, analysis and interpretation of patient-reported outcomes. John Wiley & Sons; 2007.
- Pesquisa A-ABdEd. CCEB 2013 Base LSE 2011. Alterações na aplicação do Critério Brasil, válidas a partir de 01/01/2013. Available from: http://www.abep.org/criterioBrasil.aspx.
- da Silva Machado AG, de Medeiros Fleck A, Jr., Marroni C,
 Zanotelli ML, Cantisani G, de Mello Brandao AB. Impact of

- MELD score implementation on liver allocation: experience at a Brazilian center. *Ann Hepatol* 2013; 12: 440-7.
- 22. United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS). MELD Calculator. Available from: http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/converge/resources/MeldPeldCalculator.asp?index=98.
- 23. Rodrigue JR, Nelson DR, Reed AI, Hanto DW, Curry MP. Is Model for End-Stage Liver Disease score associated with quality of life after liver transplantation? *Prog Transplant* 2011; 21: 207-14.
- Gross CR, Malinchoc M, Kim WR, Evans RW, Wiesner RH, Petz JL, Crippin JS, et al. Quality of life before and after liver

transplantation for cholestatic liver disease. *Hepatology* 1999; 29: 356-64.

Correspondence and reprint request:

Ajacio Brandão, M.D., Ph.D.
Rua Eng. Álvaro Nunes Pereira, 400/402.
90570-110 - Porto Alegre, RS. Brazil.
Tel. and Fax: +55-51-3225-3682
E-mail: ajaccio@via-rs.net

Appendix 1. Brazilian Portuguese version of the post-Liver Transplant Quality of Life (pLTQ) questionnaire.

Questionário sobre qualidade de vida após transplante de fígado

Este questionário foi concebido para descobrir como você vem se sentindo nas últimas quatro semanas. Você será perguntado sobre seus sintomas e humor em relação à sua condição de receptor de transplante de fígado. Também, será indagado em que medida ser um receptor de transplante de fígado afeta sua vida diária e seu nível de energia, e em que grau os cuidados posteriores ao transplante de fígado afetam a sua vida. Responda a todas as questões e selecione somente uma resposta para cada uma delas.

Escala:

- 1 Todo o tempo (diariamente).
- 2 Na maior parte do tempo (cerca de 5 vezes por semana).
- 3 Uma boa parte do tempo (de 2 a 4 vezes por semana).
- 4 Às vezes (uma vez por semana).
- 5 Poucas vezes (cerca de uma vez a cada duas semanas, ou duas vezes em 4 semanas).
- 6 Quase nunca (uma vez a cada período de 4 semanas).
- 7 Nunca.

Nas últimas quatro sen Todo o tempo	manas, com que frequência você s 2 Na maior parte do tempo	e preocupou com ter perda de 3 Em boa parte do tempo	memória de curto o 4 Às vezes	e/ou longo prazo? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
Nas últimas quatro sen Todo o tempo	nanas, com que frequência você s 2 Na maior parte do tempo	e sentiu deprimido? 3 Em boa parte do tempo	4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
Nas últimas quatro sen Todo o tempo	manas, com que frequência você s 2 Na maior parte do tempo	se sentiu irritado? 3 Em boa parte do tempo	4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
Nas últimas quatro sen Todo o tempo	manas, com que frequência você e 2 Na maior parte do tempo	esteve mais preocupado do que 3 Em boa parte do tempo	e o usual quanto ao 4 Às vezes	seu atual estado de sa 5 Poucas vezes	aúde? 6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
 Nas últimas quatro ser Todo o tempo 	manas, com que frequência você s 2 Na maior parte do tempo	se sentiu ansioso? 3 Em boa parte do tempo	4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
6. Nas últimas quatro ser 1 Todo o tempo	manas, com que frequência você t 2 Na maior parte do tempo	eve problemas em seguir as in 3 Em boa parte do tempo	struções para toma 4 Às vezes	r as medicações de tra 5 Poucas vezes	ansplante? 6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
 Nas últimas quatro ser 1 Todo o tempo 	manas, com que frequência você s 2 Na maior parte do tempo	se sentiu incomodado por ter c 3 Em boa parte do tempo	jue fazer arranjos e 4 Às vezes	speciais em função de 5 Poucas vezes	consultas médicas fre 6 Quase nunca	quentes? 7 Nunca
Nas últimas quatro ser Todo o tempo	manas, com que frequência você s 2 Na maior parte do tempo	se sentiu afetado por ter que ti 3 Em boa parte do tempo	rar sangue várias v 4 Às vezes	ezes? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
Nas últimas quatro ser Todo o tempo	manas, com que frequência você s 2 Na maior parte do tempo	sentiu a necessidade de esclar 3 Em boa parte do tempo	ecer tudo com o mé 4 Às vezes	édico ou o coordenador 5 Poucas vezes	do transplante? 6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
10. Nas últimas quatro se 1 Todo o tempo	emanas, com que frequência você 2 Na maior parte do tempo	se incomodou por ter que toma 3 Em boa parte do tempo	ar muitos remédios? 4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
 Nas últimas quatro se Todo o tempo 	emanas, com que frequência você 2 Na maior parte do tempo	se sentiu limitado em sua capa 3 Em boa parte do tempo	acidade de realizar 4 Às vezes	atividades diárias (tare 5 Poucas vezes	fas caseiras, higiene pe 6 Quase nunca	essoal etc.)? 7 Nunca
12. Nas últimas quatro se 1 Todo o tempo	emanas, com que frequência você 2 Na maior parte do tempo	se sentiu afetado por ter meno 3 Em boa parte do tempo	os força muscular? 4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
 Nas últimas quatro se 1 Todo o tempo do tempo 	emanas, com que frequência você 2 Na maior parte do tempo 4 Às vezes	foi incomodado por mudanças 3 Em boa parte 5 Poucas vezes	em seus padrões o	de sono? 7 Nunca		

	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência vo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	cê se sentiu afetado pela duraçã 3 Em boa parte do tempo	ăo da recuperação d 4 Às vezes	la sua cirurgia de trans 5 Poucas vezes	plante? 6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência vo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	ê foi perturbado por medo de q 3 Em boa parte do tempo	ue sua doença volte 4 Às vezes	e a ocorrer (reincida)? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voc 2 Na maior parte do tempo	ê se preocupou com talvez ter ι 3 Em boa parte do tempo	um tempo de vida m 4 Às vezes	enor? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	eê foi afetado pelo custo da sua 3 Em boa parte do tempo	medicação de trans 4 Às vezes	plante? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência vo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	tê teve problemas com as conta 3 Em boa parte do tempo	as médicas das desp 4 Às vezes	pesas de transplante? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
19.	•	semanas, com que frequência vo 2 Na maior parte do tempo			5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
20.	Nas últimas quatro	semanas, com que frequência voc	ê se sentiu afetado por ter que	aprender a caminha	ar após a cirurgia?		
	1 Todo o tempo	2 Na maior parte do tempo	3 Em boa parte do tempo	4 Ås vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voc 2 Na maior parte do tempo	rê se sentiu afetado em relação 3 Em boa parte do tempo	à sua capacidade d 4 Às vezes	e dirigir? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	ê se sentiu afetado pela apreen 3 Em boa parte do tempo	nsão da sua família o 4 Às vezes	quanto à sua doença o 5 Poucas vezes	u estado de saúde? 6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência vo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	cê se preocupou com ser um far 3 Em boa parte do tempo	rdo para seus familia 4 Às vezes	ares? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	ê se sentiu afetado por ter de to 3 Em boa parte do tempo	omar mais conta da 4 Às vezes	sua saúde? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voc 2 Na maior parte do tempo	ê teve medo de que seu fígado 3 Em boa parte do tempo	transplantado seja i 4 As vezes	rejeitado? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
		semanas, com que frequência vo			vido a estar imunodepri	imido (capacidade rec	luzida do seu
	corpo de combater Todo o tempo	infecções) como consequência de 2 Na maior parte do tempo	e estar sob medicação antirrejei 3 Em boa parte do tempo	ção? 4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
		semanas, com que frequência voc	eê se sentiu afetado por desenv	olver complicações	em virtude de tomar su	a medicação incorreta	amente ou es
	quecer de tomá-la? Todo o tempo	2 Na maior parte do tempo	3 Em boa parte do tempo	4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	tê se preocupou com ter dificuld 3 Em boa parte do tempo	lades para voltar ao 4 Às vezes	trabalho? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	ê teve dor relacionada à sua ci 3 Em boa parte do tempo	rurgia de transplante 4 Às vezes	e de fígado? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	eê foi incomodado por efeitos co 3 Em boa parte do tempo	olaterais da sua med 4 Às vezes	licação de transplante? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência vo 2 Na maior parte do tempo	cê se sentiu incomodado por lor 3 Em boa parte do tempo	ngas esperas para c 4 Às vezes	onsultas médicas? 5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca
	Nas últimas quatro 1 Todo o tempo	semanas, com que frequência voc 2 Na maior parte do tempo	ê sentiu dormências ou latejame 3 Em boa parte do tempo	entos? 4 Às vezes	5 Poucas vezes	6 Quase nunca	7 Nunca