

The Impact of Diabetic Foot Ulcer on Health Related Quality Of Life and Employment among Diabetics Attending Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital, Davangere

Lekha Tejaswi Y¹, Navinkumar Angadi²

ABSTRACT

Financial Support: None declared **Conflict of Interest:** None declared **Copy Right:** The Journal retains the copyrights of this article. However, reproduction is permissible with due acknowledgement of the source.

How to cite this article:

Tejaswi YL , Angadi N. The Impact of Diabetic Foot Ulcer on Health Related Quality Of Life and Employment among Diabetics Attending Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital, Davangere. Natl J Community Med 2018;9(11):794-797.

Author's Affiliation:

¹Intern ²Assistant professor Dept of Community Medicine JJM Medical College Davangere

Correspondence

Dr. Navinkumar Angadi navinkumarangadi7@gmail.com

Date of Submission: 07-09-18 Date of Acceptance: 21-11-18 Date of Publication: 30-11-18

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes mellitus is a major public health problem. Globally around 422 million people were living with diabetes as of 2014¹.It is estimated that by 2040 the global prevalence of diabetes mellitus will rise to almost 642 million, and around 75 % of these people will live in developing countries. Poorly managed diabetes leads to serious complications and early deaths².

Diabetic foot ulcer is most common complication and it is estimated that approximately 15% of diabetic patients will experience foot ulcer during their lifetime³.Diabetic foot is consists of ulceration, infection and/or destruction of the deep tissues, associated with neurological abnormalities and peripheral vascular disease in the lower limb⁴.

In India the prevalence of diabetic foot ulcer varies

Background: Diabetic foot ulcer is the most common complication of diabetes mellitus. Diabetic foot disease reduces quality of life. It is associated with early retirement and reduced productivity. This research was conducted to study the health related quality of life among patients with diabetic foot ulcer; and also to study the impact of diabetic foot ulcer on employment status.

Materials and Methods: This was a hospital based cross-sectional study. This study was conducted among 80 patients with diabetic foot ulcer attending the outpatient department of tertiary care teaching hospital Davangere.

Results: Among 80 patients with diabetic foot ulcer, 79% had poor environmental domain composite score, 46% of the participants had poor physical and 48% had poor social health composite score. 38% study participants were not currently working. 15% had changed the job / wok they did because of their diabetic foot ulcer.

Conclusions: Majority of patients with diabetic foot ulcer had poor health related quality of life and almost one-thirds of them were unemployed

Key Words: Health related quality life, Diabetic foot ulcer, employment status.

from 3 to 14%. Sociocultural factors like bare foot walking, use of improper footwear and lack of knowledge regarding foot care are significant contributors of diabetic foot complications in India⁵. Diabetic foot disease is not only an important factor of morbidity, mortality, costs among diabetic patients but also reduces quality of life⁶.

Diabetic foot ulcers are associated with reduced mobility and disability related to activities of daily living⁷. In this manner Diabetes can have a negative impact on the psychological functioning and quality of life of the affected individuals, particularly in the physical, social and psycho-emotional domains⁸. Previous studies have shown that half of patients with diabetic foot ulcers had either retired early, lost their jobs or found with reduced productivity⁹. With this background, the present study has been undertaken.

OBJECTIVES

This research was conducted to study the health related quality of life among patients with diabetic foot ulcer; and also to study the impact of diabetic foot ulcer on employment status.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

It is a hospital based cross-sectional study carried out among patients attending outpatient department of tertiary care teaching hospital Davangere, during the period from1st January to 31st March 2018. Total 80 patients were recruited for the study.

Inclusion criteria: Patients aged between 18 years and 60 years with diabetic foot ulcer diagnosed for a minimum of one year, attending outpatient department of tertiary care teaching hospital Davangere were encluded in the study.

Exclusion criteria: Patients with severe physical or cognitive impairments or not willing to give consent were excluded from the study.

Data collection from these 80 patients was started after getting institutional ethical review board clearance. After obtaining written consent all the 80 patients were interviewed using WHO 'Quality of life Instrument for Diabetic patients' (WHOQOL-BREF)¹⁰ tool to assess quality of life. This tool comprises of 26 items that address the areas of physical health, psychological health, social relationship and environmental health. Study participants rated all items on 5 point Likert scale. All the questionnaires were converted into local language and data was collected by conducting one to one interview. Information was collected on socio-demographic variable and impacts of Diabetic foot ulcer on employment were collected using pre-designed, pretested, semi-structured questionnaire.

Data was analysed using SPSS v17.0 and presented in the form of descriptive statistics (means, proportions, percentages).

RESULTS

In the present study most of the study participants (31.25%) were in the age group of 61-70 years followed by 51-60years (28.25%) (Table 1). Mean age of mothers was 58.82±10.26years. In our study 66.25% were from rural areas, 39(48.75%) were illiterate, and 37.5% were educated upto primary school. In our study 37.5% were currently not working and 41.25% were involved in semi-professional work. Majority of participants were belonging to class IV and V according to modified B G Prasad socio-economic classification. Majority of participants were having Diabetes mellitus since

6 to 10 years. In present study 28.75% were obese, 41.25% were alcoholic and 37.5% participants had family history of Diabetes mellitus

In the present study 70 (87.5%) reported that their physical pain prevents them from doing what they need to do, 75 (93.75%) need medical treatment to function daily and only 17 (21.25%) satisfied with capacity for work. 59(73.75%) were enjoying life, 61 (76.25%) felt their life is meaningful and only 10 (12.5) were satisfied with oneself (Table 2).

Table 1: Clinico-demographic characteristics ofstudy participants

Age group Number (art of) (15) 30-40 9 (11.2) 41-50 12 (15) 51-60 23 (28.75) 61-70 25 (31.25) >70 11 (13.75) Sex $Male$ Male 68 (85) Female 12 (15) Residence $Wala$ Rural 53 (66.25) Urban 27 (33.75) Education $Wala$ Illiterate 39 (48.75) Primary school 30 (37.5) High school 5 (6.25) PUC/Diploma 6 (25) Occupation $Wala (25)$ Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status $Warried (25)$ Class II 9 (11.25) Class II 9 (12.5) Vidow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) $Warried (25, 25)$ 1<-6 10 (12.5) 6<10 12.5)	Variable	Number (n=80) (%)
30-40 9 (11.2) 41-50 12 (15) 51-60 23 (28.75) 61-70 25 (31.25) >70 11 (13.75) Sex		
41-50 12 (15) 51-60 23 (28.75) 61-70 25 (31.25) >70 11 (13.75) Sex		9 (11 2)
51-60 23 (28.75) 61-70 25 (31.25) >70 11 (13.75) Sex 12 (15) Male 68 (85) Female 12 (15) Residence 12 (15) Rural 53 (66.25) Urban 27 (33.75) Education 11 Illiterate 39 (48.75) Primary school 30 (37.5) High school 5 (6.25) PUC/Diploma 6 (7.5) Occupation 5 Semi-Professional 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status 21 (26.25) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) PUT 1-<<6		. ,
61-70 25 (31.25) >70 11 (13.75) Sex		
>70 11 (13.75) Sex		
Sex Male 68 (85) Female 12 (15) Residence 12 (15) Rural 53 (66.25) Urban 27 (33.75) Education 11 Illiterate 39 (48.75) Primary school 30 (37.5) High school 5 (6.25) PUC/Diploma 6 (7.5) Occupation 5 Semi-Professional 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status 21 (26.25) Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class II 9 (11.25) Class II 9 (12.5) Class II 9 (12.5) Vidow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 1 1-<6		
Male 68 (85) Female 12 (15) Residence		11 (13.75)
Female 12 (15) Residence		68 (85)
Residence Rural 53 (66.25) Urban 27 (33.75) Education 11 Illiterate 39 (48.75) Primary school 30 (37.5) High school 5 (6.25) PUC/Diploma 6 (7.5) Occupation 5 Semi-Professional 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status 7 Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 1 1-<6		
Rural 53 (66.25) Urban 27 (33.75) Education 9 (48.75) Primary school 30 (37.5) High school 5 (6.25) PUC/Diploma 6 (7.5) Occupation 6 (7.5) Occupation 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 8 (10) Class I 9 (11.25) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 11 1-<6		12 (13)
Urban $27 (33.75)$ Education $39 (48.75)$ Primary school $30 (37.5)$ High school $5 (6.25)$ PUC/Diploma $6 (7.5)$ Occupation $33 (41.25)$ Unskilled $10 (12.5)$ Housewives $7 (8.75)$ Currently not working $30 (37.5)$ Socioeconomic status $21 (26.25)$ Class II $9 (11.25)$ Class III $21 (26.25)$ Class III $21 (26.25)$ Class III $9 (12.5)$ Married $73 (91.25)$ Widow/widower $7 (8.75)$ Duration of diabetes (years) $1 -<6 6$ $1 - <6$ $10 (12.5)$ $6 < 10$ $12.5)$ >210 $17 (21.25)$ Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) $10 (12.5)$ $23.24.9$ $47 (58.75)$		53 (66 25)
EducationIlliterate $39 (48.75)$ Primary school $30 (37.5)$ High school $5 (6.25)$ PUC/Diploma $6 (7.5)$ OccupationSemi-Professional $33 (41.25)$ Unskilled $10 (12.5)$ Housewives $7 (8.75)$ Currently not working $30 (37.5)$ Socioeconomic status U Class I $8 (10)$ Class II $9 (11.25)$ Class III $21 (26.25)$ Class IV and V $44 (55)$ Marital status W Married $73 (91.25)$ Widow/widower $7 (8.75)$ Duration of diabetes (years) $1 - (6 - 5)$ $1 - 6$ $10 (12.5)$ $6 - <10$ $53 (66.25)$ ≥ 10 $17 (21.25)$ Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) U Upto 22.9 $10 (12.5)$ $23 - 24.9$ $47 (58.75)$ > 25 $23 (28.75)$ Habits S Smoking $11 (13.75)$ Alcohol $33 (41.25)$ None $36 (45)$ Family History of Diabetes Y Yes $30 (37.5)$ No $50 (62.5)$		
Illiterate 39 (48.75) Primary school 30 (37.5) High school 5 (6.25) PUC/Diploma 6 (7.5) Occupation Semi-Professional 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 1-<6		27 (33.73)
Primary school $30 (37.5)$ High school $5 (6.25)$ PUC/Diploma $6 (7.5)$ Occupation $33 (41.25)$ Unskilled $10 (12.5)$ Housewives $7 (8.75)$ Currently not working $30 (37.5)$ Socioeconomic status (11.25) Class I $8 (10)$ Class II $9 (11.25)$ Class IV and V $44 (55)$ Marriad $73 (91.25)$ Widow/widower $7 (8.75)$ Duration of diabetes (years) $1 - < 6$ $1 - < 6$ $10 (12.5)$ $6 - < 10$ $53 (66.25)$ ≥ 10 $17 (21.25)$ Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) U Up to 22.9 $10 (12.5)$ $23 - 24.9$ $47 (58.75)$ > 25 $23 (28.75)$ Habits S Smoking $11 (13.75)$ Alcohol $33 (41.25)$ None $36 (45)$ Family History of Diabetes Y Yes $30 (37.5)$ No $50 (62.5)$ <td></td> <td>39 (48 75)</td>		39 (48 75)
High school 5 (6.25) PUC/Diploma 6 (7.5) Occupation 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status (11.25) Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 17 (21.25) 1-<6		
PUC/Diploma 6 (7.5) Occupation 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status 10 Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Marrial status 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 73 (66.25) ≥10 17 (21.25) Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) 10 (12.5) 23-24.9 47 (58.75) >25 23 (28.75) Habits 5 Smoking 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes 10 (37.5) No 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5)		
Occupation 33 (41.25) Semi-Professional 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status 20 (37.5) Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 10 (12.5) 1-<6 10 (12.5) 6-<10 53 (66.25) ≥10 17 (21.25) Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) 11 (13.75) Upto 22.9 10 (12.5) 23-24.9 47 (58.75) >25 23 (28.75) Habits 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes 11 (13.75) No 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glaycaemic status 11 (13.75) No 50 (62.5) <td></td> <td></td>		
Semi-Professional 33 (41.25) Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status (12.5) Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 9 (11.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Marital status (12.5) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) (12.5) 1-<6		0 (7.3)
Unskilled 10 (12.5) Housewives 7 (8.75) Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status (11.25) Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 9 (11.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Marital status (12.5) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) (12.5) 1-<6		22 (41 05)
Housewives7 (8.75)Currently not working30 (37.5)Socioeconomic status (10) Class I8 (10)Class II9 (11.25)Class III21 (26.25)Class IV and V44 (55)Marital status (12.5) Married73 (91.25)Widow/widower7 (8.75)Duration of diabetes (years) (12.5) 1-<6		
Currently not working 30 (37.5) Socioeconomic status (11.25) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Marital status 44 (55) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) $1-<6$ $1-<6$ 10 (12.5) $6-<10$ 53 (66.25) ≥ 10 17 (21.25) Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) U Up to 22.9 10 (12.5) $23-24.9$ 47 (58.75) >25 23 (28.75) Habits 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes Y Yes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status 50 (62.5)		
Socioeconomic status 8 (10) Class I 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Marital status 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 1 1-<6		
Class I 8 (10) Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Marrial status 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 1 1-<6		30 (37.5)
Class II 9 (11.25) Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Martial status 73 (91.25) Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 1 1-<6		0 (10)
Class III 21 (26.25) Class IV and V 44 (55) Marital status 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 7 1-<6		· /
Class IV and V $44 (55)$ Marital status73 (91.25)Married73 (91.25)Widow/widower7 (8.75)Duration of diabetes (years)11-<610 (12.5)6-<1053 (66.25)≥1017 (21.25)Body Mass Index(Kg/m²)10Upto 22.910 (12.5)23-24.947 (58.75)>2523 (28.75)Habits11 (13.75)Smoking11 (13.75)Alcohol33 (41.25)None36 (45)Family History of Diabetes11Yes30 (37.5)No50 (62.5)Glycaemic status11		
Marital status Narried 73 (91.25) Marital status 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 10 (12.5) 1-<6		
Married 73 (91.25) Widow/widower 7 (8.75) Duration of diabetes (years) 10 (12.5) 1-<6		44 (55)
Widow/widower7 (8.75)Duration of diabetes (years)1-<6		
Duration of diabetes (years) $1-<6$ 10 (12.5) $6-<10$ 53 (66.25) ≥ 10 17 (21.25) Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) Upto 22.9 Upto 22.9 10 (12.5) $23-24.9$ 47 (58.75) ≥ 25 23 (28.75) Habits Smoking Smoking 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes Yes Yes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status Upto 25.9		
1-<610 (12.5) $6-<10$ 53 (66.25)≥1017 (21.25)Body Mass Index(Kg/m²)Upto 22.910 (12.5)23-24.947 (58.75)>2523 (28.75)HabitsSmoking11 (13.75)Alcohol33 (41.25)None36 (45)Family History of DiabetesYes30 (37.5)No50 (62.5)Glycaemic status		7 (8.75)
6-<1053 (66.25)≥1017 (21.25)Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) $17 (21.25)$ Upto 22.910 (12.5)23-24.947 (58.75)>2523 (28.75)Habits $11 (13.75)$ Alcohol33 (41.25)None36 (45)Family History of Diabetes $11 (13.75)$ Yes30 (37.5)No50 (62.5)Glycaemic status $11 (13.75)$		
≥10 17 (21.25) Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) Upto 22.9 23-24.9 47 (58.75) >25 23 (28.75) Habits 32 (28.75) Habits 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes Yes Yes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status 50 (62.5)		
Body Mass Index(Kg/m²) Upto 22.9 10 (12.5) 23-24.9 47 (58.75) >25 23 (28.75) Habits 32 (28.75) Smoking 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes Yes Yes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status	6-<10	
Upto 22.9 10 (12.5) 23-24.9 47 (58.75) >25 23 (28.75) Habits 33 (41.25) Smoking 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes 7es Yes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status 30 (37.5)		17 (21.25)
23-24.9 47 (58.75) >25 23 (28.75) Habits	· · · ·	
>25 23 (28.75) Habits Smoking 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes Yes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status	-	
Habits 11 (13.75) Smoking 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status 30 (37.5)		
Smoking 11 (13.75) Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status 30 (37.5)	>25	23 (28.75)
Alcohol 33 (41.25) None 36 (45) Family History of Diabetes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status 30 (37.5)		
None36 (45)Family History of DiabetesYes30 (37.5)No50 (62.5)Glycaemic status		· · · ·
Family History of DiabetesYes30 (37.5)No50 (62.5)Glycaemic status		
Yes 30 (37.5) No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status		36 (45)
No 50 (62.5) Glycaemic status	Family History of Diabetes	
Glycaemic status	Yes	30 (37.5)
	No	50 (62.5)
FBS (mean±SD) 208±54.98 ()	Glycaemic status	
	FBS (mean±SD)	208±54.98 ()

Table 2: Distribution of study subjects accordingto physical health

to physical health		
Various Domains	Cases (%)	
Physical domain		
Physical pain preventing from what they	70 (87.5)	
need to do		
Need medical treatment to function daily life	75 (93.75)	
Have enough energy for everyday life	67 (83.75)	
Able to get round	46 (57.5)	
Satisfied with sleep	44 (55)	
Satisfied with ability to perform daily living	23 (28.75)	
activities		
Satisfied with capacity for work	17 (21.25)	
Psychological domain		
Enjoying life	59 (73.75)	
Life is meaningful	61 (76.25)	
Able to concentrate life	58 (72.5)	
Able to accept bodily appearance	62 (77.5)	
Satisfied with oneself	10 (12.5)	
Negative feelings	59 (73.75)	
Social domain		
Satisfied with personal relationship	17 (21.25)	
Satisfied with support from friends	17 (21.25)	
Environmental domain		
Feeling safe in daily life	60 (75)	
Healthy physical environment	73 (91.25)	
Have enough money to meet needs	52 (65)	
Availability of information needed in day to day life	69 (86.25)	
Have opportunity for leisure activities	51 (63.75)	
Satisfied with conditions of living place	17 (21.25)	
Satisfied with access to health services	17 (21.25)	
Satisfied with transport	17 (21.25)	

Table 3: Overall health related quality of life

	-		
Variable	Cases (%)	Mean±SD (Range)	
Physical health Composite Score			
Below average (≤50%)	37 (46.25)	19.13±3.5 (14-27)	
Above Average (>50%)	43 (53.75)		
Psychological health composite score			
Below average (≤50%)	19 (23.75)	17.26±1.83 (13-21)	
Above Average (>50%)	61 (76.25)		
Social health composite score			
Below average (≤50%)	39 (48.75)	5.9±1.2 (4-8)	
Above average (>50%)	41 (51.25)		
Environmental Health Composite score			
Below average (≤50%)	63 (78.75)	19.7±5.69 (13-31)	
Above Average(>50%)	17 (21.25)		

With respect to social relationship, only 17 (21.25%) were satisfied with personal relationship and support from friends (Table 2).

In the present study 73 (91.25%) were having healthy physical environment and 52 (65%) had enough money to meet their needs. But 17 (21.25%) were satisfied with conditions of living place, access to health care services and transport (Table 2).

Majority of study participants (78.75%) had poor environmental domain composite score. Almost half of the participants had poor physical and social health composite score (Table 3).

Impact of diabetic foot ulcer on employment

38% (30/80) Participants were not currently working, out of which 26.6% (8/30) reported that they were unable to work due to disability. 20% (16/80) patients reported having left job as a result of their diabetic foot ulcer. 15% (12/80) changed the job /wok they did because of their diabetic foot ulcer. Out of 50 who were currently working, 14 (28%) described difficulty in performing task at work.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, almost half of the study participants had poor quality of life. More than 2/3rd of them had poor environmental domain composite score; almost half of the participants had poor physical and social health composite score.

In the present study, 87.5% reported that their physical pain prevents them from doing what they need to do. However, 83.75% of them report that they have enough energy in everyday life. With respect to Psychological health, more than 2/3rd of the participants mentioned that they were unable to accept their physical appearance, 74% of them reported experiencing extreme negative feelings and 76.25% felt their life is meaningful. In the study conducted by Shekhar et al11 the physical component summary domain score (44.9 ± 6.3 v 28.4 ± 3.4) and mental component summary domain score $(42.5 \pm 3.8 v \ 29.5 \pm 7.1)$ were poor indicating poor health related quality of life among study participants. Similar study conducted by Mazlina et al¹² found that the Physical domain was severely compromised and Diabetic foot ulcer more negatively impacted the Physical and mental aspects. In the study conducted by Ragnarson et al¹³ patients suffering from foot ulcers valued their quality of life lower than patients whose ulcers were healed. This shows that Diabetic Foot ulcers are much more daunting on the patients as it disables them and has a major impact on their functioning and lifestyle.

With respect to social relationship, only 17(21.25%) were satisfied with personal relationship and support from friends. According to environmental health, majority of them were having healthy physical environment, and 21.25% were satisfied with conditions of living place, transport access to health care services. J M Haria et al¹⁴ studied QOL of DFU is more decreased compared to Diabetic patients due to increased treatment related costs. Which is true as 35% of our study subjects reported that they didn't have enough money to meet their needs. In spite of 65% of them reporting that they were able to manage with their income, very few of them were satisfied with their health services. This is probably because most of our subjects were from

rural parts of the town which means a long commute to the nearest hospital, and most participants spent a lot on their travel along with that of their caregiver's.

In the present study almost one thirds of study participants were not currently working, out of which 26.6% reported that they were unable to work due to disability. Study conducted by Goodridge D¹⁵ showed that there was a limited employment among patients with Diabetic foot ulcer. But in the study conducted by Nicola Waters¹⁶, almost two-thirds of study participants were currently not working and were unable to work due to disability.

In the present study one in five participants reported having left job as a result of their diabetic foot ulcer and similar finding was observed by Nicola Waters¹⁶.15% changed the job /work they did because of their diabetic foot ulcer which is lower (21.2%) than that found study conducted by Nicola Waters¹⁶. Within study participants who were currently working, 28% described difficulty in performing task at work which is lower (63.6%) than study conducted by Nicola Waters¹⁶.

Ribu et al ¹⁷ also noticed significant relationship between employment status and scoring of different domains. They also stated that higher domain scoring is due to the fact that they feel beneficial for the self, family and society.

CONCLUSIONS

In the present study majority of study participants had poor health related quality of life in environmental, physical and mental health. Almost onethirds of patients with diabetic foot ulcer were unemployed and reported of having left a job/ changed job.

RECOMMENDATION

Family members should be emphasized to provide support to patients with diabetic foot diseases which help in improving quality of life. Diabetic patients should be educated on regular foot care. At workplaces regular screening of diabetic patients for diabetic foot ulcer and those with disability due diabetic foot should be placed in a suitable job. Vocational rehabilitation is essential to prevent psychosocial morbidity.

Acknowledgment: I am thankful to all participants for their kind co-operation

Ethical approval: The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee.

REFERENCES

- World health organization. Diabetes Fact sheet N 312. Updated January 2015. Available from http://www.who.int/ en/World Health Organization, Diabetes Fact sheet Updated November 2017. Available from http://www.who.int/ en/. Accessed July 12, 2018.
- 2. International Diabetes Federation. IDF Diabetes Atlas. Seventh edition ed.; 2015.
- Nicolaas C. Schaper, Jan Apelqvist, Karel Bakker. The International Consensus and Practical Guidelines on the Management and Prevention of the Diabetic Foot. Current diabetes report 2004; 3(6):475-9.
- 4. Christos D. Liapis, Klaus Balzer, Fabrizio Benedetti-Valentini. José Fernandes e Fernandes. Diabetic foot. Vascular surgery, Part of the European Manual of Medicine book series. pp 501-521.
- 5. International journal of diabetes in developing countries. March 2008.38(1):580-01.
- Jaap J van Netten, Mendel Baba, Peter A. Lazzarini. Epidemiology of diabetic foot disease and diabetes-related lowerextremity amputation in Australia: a systematic review protocol. Systematic Reviews 2017.v 6:101.
- Goodbridge D, Trepman E, Embil JM. Health related quality of life in diabetic patients with foot ulcers. Literature review. Journal of Wound Continence Nurs 2005;32(6):368-77.
- Serigo Aguinaldo De Almeda, Maika Moura Silveira, Patrica Ferreira Do, Espirito Santo, Rita De Cassia Pereira, Geraldo Magela Salome. Assessment of quality of life of patients with Diabetes Mellitus and Foot Ulcer. Rev Bras Cir Plast 2013; 28(1): 142-6.
- 9. Brod M. Quality of life issues in patients with Diabetes and lower extremety Ulcers: patients and care givers. Qual Life Res1998;7(4): 365-72.
- The World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL) -BREF. World Health Organization 2004. Available from www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/en/english _whoqol.pdf. accessed on July 21st, 2018.
- 11. Sekhar MS, Thomas RR, Unnikrishnan MK, Vijayanarayana K, Rodrigues GS. Impact of diabetic foot ulcer on health-related quality of life: A cross-sectional study. Epub 2015; 28:3-4.
- 12. Mazlina M, Shamsul AS, Saini Jeffery FA. Health related quality of life in patients with diabetic foot problems in Malaysia. Medical journal of Malaysia 2011; 66(3):234-8.
- 13. Rangerson Tennvall G, Apelgvist J. Health-related quality of life in patients with diabetes mellitus and foot ulcers. J Diabetes Complications 2000; Sep-Oct; 14(5):235-41
- Haraia JM, Singh VK, Jain SK. Life with Diabetic foot ulcer: A cross sectional study. International Journal of scientific study 2014;1(6):33-5.
- 15. Goodridge D, Trepman E, Embil JM. Health related quality of life in diabetic patients with foot ulcers. Journal of wound Ostomy Continence Nursing 2005; 32(6):368-77.
- Nicola Waters, Samantha Holloway. Personal perceptions of impact of diabetic foot diseases on employment. Diabetic Foot Canada 2013; 1(2): 32-40.
- 17. Ribu L, Hanestad BR, Moum T, Birkeland K, Rusteon T. Health-related quality of life among patients with diabetes and foot ulcers: association with demographic and clinical characteristics. J Diabetes Complications 2007;21(4):227-36.