

Appendix 6. Study populations involved in PROM development and content validity studies (marked with *)

PROM	Language	Country	Patients	Patient input	Mean age [range] yr	Gender % female	Disease characteristics	Professionals	Characteristics of professionals	Professional input
DFS[34]	English	UK	10 + 14 + 12	Concept elicitation and pilot testing relevance and comprehensibility	61 [46-74]	33-40%	Diabetic foot ulcers	0		
DFS-SF[35]	English	US	0					0		
DFS-SF[37]*	Chinese	China	6	Comprehensibility and relevance				0		
DFS-SF[39]*	Spanish	Spain	0					?		Evaluation content validity
PRO-DM-Thai[40]	Thai	Thailand	12 + 15	Concept elicitation/ comprehensibility, face validity	61 [49-70]	50%	T2DM, disease duration 11 [2-20] yr	9 + 17	3 physicians, 2 nurses, 2 pharmacists, and 2 nutritionists	Concept elicitation / relevance, comprehensiveness, comprehensibility
IWADL/ APPADL[41]	English	US	54 + 24	Concept elicitation, comprehensibility			T2DM and BMI of 25–40 kg/m ²	0		
QOLID[43]	English/ Hindi ^a	India	20	Concept elicitation, comprehensibility			T2DM	8	4 clinicians and 4 diabetes educators	Relevance, comprehensibility
DQLCTQ[44]	English	US	30	Rating domains			T1DM (n=23), T2DM (n=7)	11	Clinicians / experts on HRQL and research	Rating domains / evaluating face- and content validity of draft PROM
Diabetes-39[45]	English	US	?	Concept elicitation			Diabetes	?	Physicians, certified diabetes educators, pharmacists	Concept elicitation
Diabetes-39[46]*	Arabic	Jordan	30	Comprehensibility				0		
Diabetes-	Vietnamese	Vietnam	10	Comprehensibility				0		

39[47]*							
Diabetes-39[48]*	Portuguese	Brazil	4	Comprehensibility		0	
Diabetes-39 SF[51]	Chinese	Taiwan	0			0	
C-CWIS[54]	Chinese	China	20	Pilot testing	Diabetic foot ulcers	5	2 majored in medicine, 3 majored in nursing
Transcultural adjustment							
a Language unsure							