

Validation of a Persian-version of Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) in Iranians with knee injuries

M. Salavati Ph.D.†, M. Mazaheri M.Sc.‡*, H. Negahban M.Sc.§, S. M. Sohani M.Sc.||,
M. R. Ebrahimian M.D.¶, I. Ebrahimi Ph.D.||, A. Kazemnejad Ph.D.# and M. Salavati Ph.D.††

† Department of Physical Therapy, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation, Tehran, Iran

‡ Musculoskeletal Research Center, School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

§ Department of Physical therapy, School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences, Ahvaz, Iran

|| Department of Physical Therapy, School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

¶ Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Milad Hospital, Tehran, Iran

Faculty of Medical Sciences, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

†† Department of Preschool Education, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation, Tehran, Iran

Summary

Objective: To adapt culturally and validate Persian-version of the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) in a sample of Iranians with knee injuries.

Methods: Cultural adaptation included providing of forward and backward translations, quality rating and pilot testing. A sample of 147 patients with anterior cruciate ligament (ACL), meniscus and combined (ACL and meniscus) injuries was asked to complete two questionnaires including the KOOS and Short-Form 36 Health Survey (SF-36). The KOOS was readministered to 54 patients 6–8 days after the first visit. Test–retest reliability and internal consistency were assessed, using Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) and Cronbach's alpha, respectively. Dimensionality was assessed, using item-scale correlation after correction for overlap and construct validity, using *a priori* hypothesized correlations with the SF-36.

Results: All patients found the Persian-version of the KOOS to be clear and unambiguous in pilot testing. Minimum ICC level of 0.70 was exceeded by all subscales with the exception of Sport and Recreation (Sport/Rec) subscale. Minimum Cronbach's alpha level of 0.70 was exceeded by all subscales with the exception of Symptoms and Knee-related Quality of Life (QoL). Minimum Spearman correlation coefficient of 0.40 for each item-scale was exceeded by 34 items. All *a priori* hypotheses were supported by the presence of higher correlations between similar constructs than between dissimilar constructs of the KOOS and SF-36.

Conclusion: The Persian-version of the KOOS is a culturally-adapted, reliable and valid outcome measure to be used in Iranian patients with knee injuries, with its psychometric properties in agreement with the original versions.

© 2008 Osteoarthritis Research Society International. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Key words: Knee injuries, Outcome, Validation, Iran.

Introduction

It is now widely accepted that there is a need for clinical outcome research to evaluate the benefits and cost effectiveness of new diagnostic, surgical and rehabilitative approaches for the treatment of knee problems¹. Clinicians and researchers wishing to select an instrument for measuring health outcome of patients with knee injuries have a choice of several patient-centered instruments.

Characteristics of patients that the instrument is developed for, instrument content and psychometric properties are criteria recommended for selection of instruments².

The Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS), as an extension of the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities (WOMAC), is a relatively new, well-designed, simple self-administered instrument developed to assess short-term and long-term symptoms and function in patients with knee injuries and osteoarthritis. It has a good evidence of reliability, validity and responsiveness in different populations with varying pathologies, injury durations, ages and activity levels³. The KOOS has been validated in American-English, Swedish, German, Singapore-English and Chinese^{4–7}.

It has been argued that cross-cultural validation of patient-centered outcome measures are needed to compare

*Address correspondence and reprint requests to: Masood Mazaheri, Musculoskeletal Research Center, School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Hezarjarib Boulevard, Isfahan, Iran. Tel: 98-21-221-80039; Fax: 98-21-887-88170; E-mail: mazaheri_masood@yahoo.com

Received 19 August 2007; revision accepted 1 March 2008.

and contrast results, aggregate data from different countries, strengthen causal inference on effects of treatments and to investigate the natural history of health conditions⁸. The aims of this study were to linguistically validate of a Persian-version of KOOS and present data on its psychometric properties in patients with Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL), meniscus and combined (ACL and meniscus) injuries.

Methods

TRANSLATION PROCESS

Guidelines recommended by International Quality of Life Assessment project group were used to translate the KOOS from English to Persian, the Iranian language⁹. At the first step, two independent bilingual translators, native in Persian translated the original English version into Persian and then agreed on a common forward version. Two other bilinguals, who were native Persian speakers, scored the quality of the agreed-on forward version from the aspects of clarity, common language and conceptual equivalence. Quality ratings were used to modify the translation as needed to develop a preliminary common forward translation. At next step, forward version was back translated into English by another translator with further modifications, if needed. Finally, the forward version was tested as pilot among 30 Persian speaking patients with ACL, meniscus and combined injuries for taking into account any difficult or confusing item or response choice.

PATIENTS

From March 2006 to March 2007, a convenient sample of 147 patients (age range 16–59; 131 males, 16 females) with knee injuries was recruited from the Department of Orthopedics at Moayeri Hospital and Milad Hospital, Tehran, Iran. All patients were diagnosed as ACL, meniscus and combined injuries by their orthopedic surgeon, based on clinical and Magnetic Resonance Imaging findings. All patients were Persian native speakers with an intermediate or higher educational level. Patients were excluded if they had other diagnoses than ACL, meniscus and combined injury, involvement of other joints affecting lower extremity or back, systematic inflammatory rheumatic disease (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis, ankylosing spondylitis, etc.), osteoarthritis, neurological or vascular conditions and psychiatric disorders. The patients suffered from knee injuries for at least 1.5 months prior to participation in the study. Questionnaires including the KOOS and Short-Form 36 Health Survey (SF-36) were administered to each patient by a trained clinician when visiting the surgeon. The Ethics Committee at University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation approved the study. All patients gave their informed consent before participation in the study.

INSTRUMENTS

The KOOS is a 42-item disease-specific questionnaire with five subscales: Pain, Symptoms, Activities of Daily Living (ADL), Sport and Recreation (Sport/Rec) and Knee-related Quality of Life (QoL). A five-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (no problems) to 4 (extreme problems) is used for scoring each item. Raw scores are transformed to a 0–100 scale with 0 indicating extreme problems and 100 indicating no problems, calculated for each subscale separately³.

The SF-36 is a 36-item generic self-administered instrument of health status. It consists of eight subscales: Physical Functioning (PF), Role-Physical (RP), Bodily Pain (BP), General Health (GH), Vitality (VT), Social Functioning (SF), Role-Emotional (RE) and Mental Health (MH). The eight subscales are hypothesized to form two distinct higher-ordered factors namely Physical Health and Mental Health summary measures. These eight subscales are scored from 0 to 100 with higher scores indicating better health status¹⁰. Evidence indicates that SF-36 may be a suitable outcome measure in lower limb dysfunctions¹¹. Iranian-version of SF-36 has been validated for use in Iran¹².

ASSESSMENT OF PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Reliability

The KOOS was readministered to 54 patients, including ACL ($n=26$), meniscus ($n=10$) and combined ($n=18$) injuries, 6–8 days after the first visit to evaluate the instrument's test–retest reliability. Because the variation between trials is to a great extent related to the instrument or subject and not

rather, due to its self-administering mode, so the test–retest reliability of the KOOS was analyzed using one-way random effect model of Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) to estimate the amount of variation over time in stable patients. An ICC equal or greater than 0.70 was considered acceptable for test–retest reliability¹³. Also, internal consistency, an additional measure of reliability, was calculated on the first administration using Cronbach's alpha statistic to estimate the average of the correlations between items within a subscale. Cronbach's alpha equal or greater than 0.70 was considered satisfactory for internal consistency¹³.

Dimensionality

Dimensionality was assessed using the correlation between an item and the subscale score as a whole, omitting that item (item-scale correlation after correction for overlap). Spearman correlation coefficients equal or greater than 0.40 was considered acceptable¹³.

Construct validity

Evidence for construct validity can only be accumulated by *a priori* hypothesized patterns of associations with other validated instruments¹. It was hypothesized *a priori* that the correlations between the KOOS Pain and SF-36 BP subscales should be high, the correlations between the KOOS ADL and Sport/Rec and SF-36 PF subscales should be high, the correlations between the KOOS subscales and the SF-36 subscales of Physical Health (PF, RP, BP) should be higher than between the KOOS subscales and the SF-36 subscales of Mental Health (GH, VT, SF, RE, MH). The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (r_s) was used to assess construct validity¹³.

Results

TRANSLATION PROCESS

To match with Iranian culture three items were modified. Item 13 in ADL subscale regarding degree of difficulty when "get in/out of bath", was changed to "take a bath", because tubs are not used frequently in Iran nowadays. The word "socks/stocking" used in items 9 and 11 of the same subscale was changed to its single Persian equivalent, because two separate words are not used for differentiating them in Persian. No difficulties encountered by the respondents were noted in pilot study.

PATIENTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Subjects included 60 (41%), 31 (21%) and 56 (38%) patients with ACL, meniscus and combined injuries, respectively. The mean age of subjects was 31.4, mostly male (89%) and generally with High school and University educational levels (94%). Characteristics of patients in each group are shown in Table I.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table II represents the mean, standard deviation (SD), median, range and proportion of patients scoring at the floor (zero) and the ceiling (100) levels on the 0–100 scale for the five KOOS and eight SF-36 subscales.

The number of patients receiving floor or ceiling effect was negligible for KOOS Pain, Symptom and ADL subscales. For the subscales Sport/Rec and QoL the worst possible score was detected in 21 and 17 subjects, respectively. For the SF-36, floor and ceiling effects were negligible for the subscales PF, BP, GH, VT and MH, among others.

Only five of 6174 items (0.08%) were missing for the KOOS data. Scoring was calculated for the five subscales in all 147 patients. However, 29 of 5292 items (0.55%) were missing for the SF-36 data. Scoring was calculated for the eight subscales in all 147 patients except RE, where scoring was done for 146 patients.

ASSESSMENT OF PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Reliability

Minimum ICC level of 0.70 was exceeded by all subscales with the exception of Sport/Rec. The ICCs were: Pain 0.91, Symptoms 0.83, ADL 0.90, Sport/Rec 0.61 and QoL 0.88.

Also, minimum Cronbach's alpha level of 0.70 was exceeded by all subscales with the exception of Symptoms and QoL. Cronbach's alphas were: Pain 0.88, Symptoms 0.25, ADL 0.94, Sport/Rec 0.89 and QoL 0.64.

Dimensionality

Table III demonstrates the item-scale correlation between each item and its hypothesized subscale. Spearman correlation coefficient of 0.40 was exceeded by all subscales with the exception of seven Symptoms and one of QoL items.

Construct validity

Table IV shows the correlations between the scores of KOOS and the SF-36 subscales. All *priori* hypotheses were supported by the presence of high correlation between KOOS Pain and SF-36 BP ($r_s = 0.65$), high correlation between KOOS ADL and SF-36 PF ($r_s = 0.63$) and high correlation between KOOS Sport/Rec and SF-36 PF ($r_s = 0.48$). Also, higher correlations were found between KOOS subscales and SF-36 subscales of Physical Health than between KOOS subscales and SF-36 subscales of Mental Health.

Discussion

The results of the present study indicate that the Persian-version of the KOOS is a reliable and valid measure of pain, symptoms, activities of daily living, sport and recreation and quality of life in patients with a variety of knee injuries, including ACL, meniscus and combined injuries.

The test-retest reliability coefficients were high for all subscales but Sport/Rec which is consistent with the Singapore-English version of the KOOS⁷. Although, reliability

coefficient of 0.81 has been reported for Sport/Rec in a group of subjects with ACL and combined meniscus injury in the American-English version, but the smaller sample size (21 patients) of that study makes the comparison difficult⁴. Also, inclusion of patients with osteoarthritis in the Swedish-version makes its reliability coefficient of 0.78 incomparable with our result⁵. The internal consistency was satisfactory for three of five subscales. Cronbach's alpha for QoL subscale was marginally lower than 0.70 (0.65) while for Symptoms was extremely low (0.25). This is in contrast with the Swedish-version of the KOOS in which it was 0.74 for Symptoms⁵. Inclusion of patients with osteoarthritis in the Swedish-version, as stated above, may explain this inconsistency to some extent.

Dimensionality determined by the item-scale correlation showed promising results indicating that each item strongly correlated with its hypothesized subscale, except for all seven Symptoms and one of QoL items. Roos *et al.* when assessing dimensionality by performing principal component factor analysis found that the items in the Symptoms subscale do not estimate the hypothesized subscale, similar to our findings⁵.

Construct validity was supported by the presence of higher correlations between the KOOS and SF-36 subscales measuring similar constructs and lower correlations between the subscales measuring dissimilar constructs. With regard to the construct validity, our findings were comparable to those in the Swedish-version in most aspects. First, the correlation coefficients of 0.65 between KOOS Pain and SF-36 BP, 0.63 between KOOS ADL and SF-36 PF and 0.48 between KOOS Sport/Rec and SF-36 PF obtained in this study were close to those values found in the Swedish-version, 0.65, 0.68 and 0.57, respectively. Second, the mean correlation between the KOOS subscales and SF-36 subscales with strong and weak abilities to measure Physical Health was 0.42 and 0.15, respectively, similar to 0.44 and 0.13 in the Swedish-version. Third, the Symptoms subscale showed the weakest correlation to SF-36 Physical Health. As stated by Roos *et al.*, the symptoms are not important determinators of Physical Health as the other four subscales, hence the symptoms and functional limitations should be reported separately and not aggregated into a single score⁵.

One limitation of the present study was the small sample size of subjects with meniscus injury, which did not allow comparison of psychometric properties especially test-retest

Table I
Characteristics of the diagnostic groups

	ACL (n=60)	Meniscus (n=31)	Combined (n=56)	Total
Age (years)				
Mean (SD)	31.6 (8.3)	34.8 (10.8)	29.4 (8.0)	31.4 (9.0)
Range	17–52	20–59	16–53	16–59
Sex (no.)				
Male	54	27	50	131
Female	6	4	6	16
Educational level (no.)				
Intermediate school	4	4	1	9
High school	33	12	28	73
University	23	15	27	65

Years of education for "Intermediate school", "High school" and "University" levels are 6–8, 9–12 and >12 years, respectively.

Table II
Distribution of scores for the KOOS and SF-36 subscales

	Mean	SD	Median	Range	Percent at floor/ceiling
KOOS Pain	60	19.9	61	11–100	0/0.7
KOOS Symptoms	54	12.9	54	14–89	0/0
KOOS ADL	65	19.7	66	7–96	0/0
KOOS Sport/Rec	26	23.0	20	0–100	14.3/0.7
KOOS QoL	26	17.7	25	0–81	11.6/0
SF-36 PF	46	22.1	45	0–95	1.4/0
SF-36 RP	24	32.4	0	0–100	53.1/6.8
SF-36 BP	46	22.3	42	0–100	4.1/2
SF-36 GH	62	19.1	65	10–100	0/1.4
SF-36 VT	60	20.0	60	0–100	0.7/2
SF-36 SF	64	23.7	63	0–100	2/12.2
SF-36 RE	46	43.3	33	0–100	39.5/32
SF-36 MH	68	19.6	68	8–100	0/3.4

Table III
Dimensionality of KOOS items (item-scale correlations after correction for overlap)

KOOS item omitted	Correlation coefficient of omitted item with remaining scale items
Pain	
P1. How often do you experience knee pain	0.61
P2. Twisting/pivoting on your knee	0.55
P3. Straightening knee fully	0.65
P4. Bending knee fully	0.55
P5. Walking on flat surface	0.73
P6. Going up or down stairs	0.76
P7. At night while in bed	0.66
P8. Sitting or lying	0.65
P9. Standing upright	0.64
Symptoms	
S1. Do you have swelling in your knee	0.07
S2. Do you feel grinding/friction, hear clicking/cracking or any other type of noise when your knee moves	0.31
S3. Does your knee jam or lock when moving	0.30
S4. Can you straighten your knee fully	-0.14
S5. Can you bend your knee fully	-0.22
S6. How severe is your knee joint stiffness after first wakening in the morning	0.18
S7. How severe is your knee stiffness after sitting, lying or resting later in the day	0.30
ADL	
A1. Descending stairs	0.64
A2. Ascending stairs	0.72
A3. Rising from sitting	0.72
A4. Standing	0.68
A5. Bending to floor/pick up an object	0.71
A6. Walking on flat surface	0.75
A7. Getting in/out of car	0.73
A8. Going shopping	0.83
A9. Putting on socks/stockings	0.70
A10. Rising from bed	0.78
A11. Taking off socks/stockings	0.70
A12. Lying in bed	0.77
A13. Getting in/out of bath	0.79
A14. Sitting	0.64
A15. Getting on/off toilet	0.47
A16. Heavy domestic duties	0.61
A17. Light domestic duties	0.76
Sport/Rec	
Sp1. Squatting	0.62
Sp2. Running	0.81
Sp3. Jumping	0.85
Sp4. Twisting/pivoting on your injured knee	0.74
Sp5. Kneeling	0.72
QoL	
Q1. How often are you aware of your knee problem	0.45
Q2. Have you modified your life style to avoid potentially damaging activities to your knee	0.25
Q3. How much are you troubled with lack of confidence in your knee	0.55
Q4. In general, how much difficulty do you have with your knee	0.59

Item-scale correlations less than 0.40 are in bold figures. All correlations over 0.22 were significant at 0.01 level.

Table IV
Construct validity of KOOS subscales (correlations with SF-36 subscales)

SF-36 subscale	SF-36 Physical Health	SF-36 Mental Health	KOOS Pain	KOOS Symptoms	KOOS ADL	KOOS Sport/Rec	KOOS QoL
PF	0.76	0.42	0.48	0.16	0.63	0.48	0.41
RP	0.79	0.51	0.38	0.15	0.38	0.32	0.37
BP	0.78	0.49	0.65	0.34	0.62	0.48	0.45
GH	0.47	0.49	0.15	0.15	0.18	0.02	0.17
VT	0.54	0.75	0.34	0.19	0.39	0.22	0.27
SF	0.61	0.72	0.34	0.15	0.49	0.32	0.31
RE	0.51	0.83	0.26	0.13	0.34	0.20	0.28
MH	0.39	0.71	0.17	0.15	0.23	0.07	0.13

All correlations over 0.22 were significant at 0.01 level.

reliability among the mentioned groups. The authors recommend further validation of the Iranian-version of the KOOS in different groups of patients with different characteristics. Also, future research is suggested to assess its responsiveness, which makes it a valid instrument for evaluation of the effectiveness of surgical and rehabilitative interventions. However, based on the results obtained in the present study when the symptoms are the main focus, the use of the instrument for evaluating and differentiating purposes may be limited.

In conclusion, the Iranian-version of KOOS disease-specific questionnaire offers psychometric properties that make it a valid and reliable instrument for patients with various knee injuries.

Conflict of interest

None of the authors have any financial or other interests relating to the manuscript to be submitted for publication in Osteoarthritis and Cartilage.

Acknowledgments

The study was supported by University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation, Tehran, Iran. The authors would like to acknowledge Professor Ewa Roos, Institute of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southern Denmark, for sharing her knowledge on the KOOS.

References

- Irrgang JJ, Anderson AF. Development and validation of health-related quality of life measures for the knee. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2002; 402:95–109.
- Garraff AM, Brealey S, Gillespie WJ, DAMASK Trial Team. Patient-assessed health instruments for the knee: a structured review. Rheumatology (Oxford) 2004;43:1414–23.
- Roos EM, Lohmander LS. The Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS): from joint injury to osteoarthritis. Health Qual Life Outcomes 2003;1:64.
- Roos EM, Roos HP, Lohmander LS, Ekdahl C, Beynnon BD. Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) – development of a self-administered outcome measure. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 1998;28:88–96.
- Roos EM, Roos HP, Ekdahl C, Lohmander LS. Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) – validation of a Swedish version. Scand J Med Sci Sports 1998;8:439–48.

6. Kessler S, Lang S, Puhl W, Stove J. The Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score – a multifunctional questionnaire to measure outcome in knee arthroplasty. *Z Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb* 2003;141: 277–82.
 7. Xie F, Li SC, Roos EM, Fong KY, Lo NN, Yeo SJ, *et al.* Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of Singapore English and Chinese versions of the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) in Asians with knee osteoarthritis in Singapore. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2006;14:1098–103.
 8. Tuzun EH, Eker L, Aytar A, Daskapan A, Bayramoglu M. Acceptability, reliability, validity and responsiveness of the Turkish version of WOMAC osteoarthritis index. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2005;13: 28–33.
 9. Bullinger M, Alonso J, Apolone G, Leplege A, Sullivan M, Wood-Dauphinee S, *et al.* Translating health status questionnaires and evaluating their quality: the IQOLA Project approach. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1998;51:913–23.
 10. Ware JE Jr, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care* 1992;30:473–83.
 11. Paxton EW, Fithian DC. Outcome instruments for patellofemoral arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2005;436:66–70.
 12. Montazeri A, Goshtasebi A, Vahdaninia M, Gandek B. The Short Form Health Survey (SF-36): translation and validation study of the Iranian version. *Qual Life Res* 2005;14:875–82.
 13. Fayers PM, Machin D. *Quality of Life: Assessment, Analysis and Interpretation*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons; 2000.
-