Published in final edited form as:

Am J Prev Med. 2007 September ; 33(3): 214–218.

Health-Related Quality of Life in Older Adults at Risk for Disability

Erik J. Groessl, PhD^{1,2}, Robert M. Kaplan, PhD³, W. Jack Rejeski, PhD⁴, Jeffrey A. Katula, PhD⁴, Abby C. King, PhD⁵, Georita Frierson, PhD⁶, Nancy W. Glynn, PhD⁷, Fang-Chi Hsu, PhD⁴, Michael Walkup, MS⁴, and Marco Pahor, MD⁸

1 Health Services Research and Development Unit, VA San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, CA

2 Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA

3 Department of Health Services, University of California Los Angeles

4 Department of Health and Exercise Science, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC

5 Department of Health Research & Policy and Medicine, Stanford University

6 Diversity Programs and Research Initiatives, The Cooper Institute

7 Department of Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh

8 Department of Aging and Geriatric Research, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Abstract

Background—The number of older adults living in the U.S. continues to increase, and recent research has begun to target interventions to older adults who have mobility limitations and are at risk for disability. The objective of this study is to describe and examine correlates of health-related quality of life in this population subgroup using baseline data from a larger intervention study.

Methods—The Lifestyle Interventions and Independence for Elders–Pilot study (LIFE–P) was a randomized, controlled trial that compared a physical activity intervention to a non-exercise educational intervention with 424 older adults at risk for disability. Baseline data (collected April–December 2004; analyzed in 2006) included demographics, medical history, the Quality of Well-Being Scale (QWB-SA), a timed 400 m walk, and the Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB). Descriptive HRQOL data are presented. Hierarchical linear regression models were used to examine correlates of HRQOL.

Results—The mean QWB-SA score for the sample was 0.630 on an interval scale ranging from 0.0 (death) to 1.0 (asymptomatic, optimal functioning). The mean of 0.630 is 0.070 lower than a comparison group of healthy older adults. The variables associated with lower HRQOL included white ethnicity, more comorbid conditions, slower 400-m walk times, and lower SPPB balance and chair stand scores.

Conclusions—Older adults who are at risk for disability had reduced HRQOL. Surprisingly, however, mobility was a stronger correlate of HRQOL than an index of comorbidity, suggesting that interventions addressing mobility limitations may provide significant health benefits to this population.

Correspondence and reprint requests: Erik J. Groessl, PhD, Health Services Research and Development, VA San Diego Healthcare System, 3350 La Jolla Village Dr. 111 N-1, San Diego, CA 92161, Phone: (858) 642-6347; Fax: (858) 552-4321; Email: egroessl@ucsd.edu

No financial conflict of interest was reported by the authors of this paper.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Impaired mobility, defined as the ability to walk safely and independently,¹ has been shown to predict subsequent broader disability involving independent daily living activities.^{2, 3} Using these findings, researchers identified a subgroup of older adults that are at risk for developing disability.⁴⁻⁷ These older adults are characterized by a sedentary lifestyle and impaired mobility. They walk more slowly and have reduced strength and balance. They are considered “at risk for disability” because they have reduced mobility but can still perform daily living activities.

Mobility and daily living are important elements of the broader concept of health-related quality of life (HRQOL)^{8, 9} and most measures of generic HRQOL include questions about mobility.¹⁰⁻¹³ The HRQOL of older adults is usually described in association with specific diseases, demographic characteristics, and/or healthy epidemiological samples,¹⁴⁻¹⁶ but few, if any, studies describe the HRQOL of older adults who share functional limitations. The objective of this study is to describe and examine correlates of HRQOL in older adults considered at risk for disability.

METHODS

This manuscript uses baseline questionnaire data (collected April–December 2004; analyzed in 2006) from all Lifestyle Interventions and Independence for Elders pilot (LIFE-P) study participants. The study has been described in detail elsewhere.^{17, 18}

Clinical Trial

The LIFE-P study is a multisite, randomized controlled trial (RCT) in which older adults (aged 70–89) at risk for disability were assigned to either a physical activity or a successful aging intervention, both lasting 12 months. The physical activity intervention consisted of a structured exercise program focused on walking supplemented with behavioral counseling.¹⁹ The successful aging intervention consisted of educational meetings not expected to impact the main study outcomes. The goal of the LIFE-P study was to obtain key design benchmarks in preparation for a larger study of the efficacy of physical activity for preventing disability in this population.

Participants

Participants were 424 older adults considered at risk for disability, which is defined as having a Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB) score of <10.^{4, 6} Other inclusion criteria were ages 70–89 years, sedentary lifestyle (not actively participating in a formal exercise program within the past three months), and ability to complete a 400 m walk within 15 minutes. Exclusion criteria included history of significant or recent co-morbidity. Comprehensive inclusion and exclusion criteria are given elsewhere.²⁰ Participants were recruited from four communities in geographically diverse areas of the U.S. (Pittsburgh, Winston-Salem, Dallas, and Palo Alto) using a variety of recruitment strategies.²⁰

Measures

Demographic—Participants completed baseline demographic questionnaires.

Comorbidity Index—The index of comorbidity is the sum of yes (1) or no (0) self-report responses for 10 prevalent comorbidities: hypertension, heart attack, heart failure, stroke, cancer, diabetes, broken hip, arthritis, liver disease, and lung disease. To verify reported comorbidities, participants provided evidence of prescribed medications or the exact name of medications. Only 5.4% (39/725) of “yes” responses could not be verified. These responses were coded as “possible” comorbidity and given a value of 0.5. A maximum likelihood (SAS

Proc MIXED) approach was used to estimate the comorbidity index from observed responses for cases ($18/424 = 1.9\%$) with missing data.

Mobility/Physical Functioning—Each person completed a timed 400 m self-paced walk without assistance or assistive devices.^{21, 22} Physical functioning was measured using the SPPB⁵ which assesses 3 areas of performance: balance, chair stands, and a 4-m self-paced walk. Trained observers assign a categorical score to each area of function ranging from 0 (inability to complete the test) to 4 (highest performance level). A summary score ranging from 0-12 is calculated by summing the 3 subscale scores.

Hand Grip Strength—Grip strength was measured using an adjustable, hydraulic dynamometer (Jamar Hand Dynamometer, Fred Sammons, Inc.). The best performance of two trials was selected for each side, and the average of the left and right hand were used for analysis. Predictive validity has been shown for both disability²³ and mortality.²⁴

Health-Related Quality of Life—Health-related quality of life was assessed using the Quality of Well-being Scale- Self-administered (QWB-SA).^{13, 25} The QWB-SA is a generic measure of HRQOL that combines preference-weighted values for symptoms and functioning.²⁶ Scores range from 0 (death) to 1.0 (asymptomatic, optimum functioning).²⁷ The measure has been used in multisite NIH clinical trials^{28–30} and with various medical conditions.^{31–36}

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics reported include means with standard deviations and proportions where appropriate. Linear regression analysis was used to examine correlates of HRQOL. Independent variables were entered into the models in three blocks, with QWB-SA scores as the dependent variable. Initially, age, education, gender, ethnicity, and marital status were entered and retained if $p < 0.15$. Education (no college vs college or more), ethnicity (white vs. non-white) and marital status (married vs. non-married) were converted to binary coding. Next, the comorbidity index was tested and retained ($p < 0.15$). Finally, the 400-m walk time, three SPPB subscales, and average grip strength were entered and variables were retained if $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

Mean baseline scores are presented in Table 1. There were no missing data for the QWB-SA and other health variables. Table 2 presents QWB-SA scores for a variety of samples from published studies. However, the samples differ on factors often related to HRQOL (age, gender).

Regression analyses examining correlates of HRQOL are presented in Table 3. Ethnicity was the only demographic variable retained. The co-morbidity index and ethnicity variable tested in the second block were both retained. Of the functional variables entered in the third and final block, the 400 m walk time, SPPB balance subscale, and SPPB chair stand subscale were retained. The correlation between the 400 m walk and the gait speed subscale was substantial ($r = -0.55$, $p < 0.0001$).

DISCUSSION

The mean QWB-SA score for a sample of older adults considered at risk for disability was below a score found for healthy older adults³⁷ Although these samples differ slightly, this difference ($0.704 - 0.634 = 0.070$) is substantial and well beyond the minimally clinically important difference (MCID) of 0.030 estimated for the QWB-SA.^{41,42}

The decrement of 0.070 is more than the amount attributed to a variety of diseases including colitis, migraine, arthritis, stroke, ulcer, asthma, and anxiety.¹⁴ Thus declining mobility may have a greater negative impact on HRQOL than many distinct disease states. In this sample, mobility function was related to HRQOL independent of a comorbidity index. This finding highlights the level of impairment in this subpopulation and underscores the need to develop effective interventions for older adults at risk for disability regardless of the diseases they may or may not have.^{2, 6} It is also important to note that the three mobility variables (400-m walk time, the balance SPPB subscale, and the chair stands SPPB subscale) accounted for unique aspects of HRQOL. This finding provides evidence that mobility is multidimensional.

The QWB-SA is only one of many generic HRQOL instruments and includes questions about mobility so a correlation is not surprising. Although the QWB includes mobility items, the QWB-SA assesses 59 symptoms which usually have a larger impact on scores than mobility or other function-related questions.

In contrast to other published studies,^{43–45} White participants had lower QWB-SA scores than non-Whites (0.627 vs. 0.652). However, African Americans and other ethnic groups have reported higher satisfaction with physical function than white participants elsewhere.⁴⁶ Although interesting, the difference of 0.025 is below the minimally clinically important difference (MCID) of the QWB-SA^{41,42} and differences in QWB-SA scores by race/ethnicity have not been found elsewhere. Unexpectedly, gender and age were not significantly related to QWB-SA scores. Typically, HRQOL scores are lower for women and decrease with older age.^{14,38,47–49} However, the study sample had a restricted range of ages and mobility level

Our results are cross-sectional and subsequently limit causal inference. Also, the inclusion and exclusion criteria used in the LIFE-P trial limit generalizability. Therefore, study results should be interpreted appropriately. Replicating the findings with other measures of HRQOL and mobility is important because the measures used differ from other measures of the same constructs.

In summary, QWB-SA scores for older adults at risk for disability were below those of a sample of healthy older adults, providing evidence that the HRQOL of this segment of older adults may benefit from intervention. Although much of the variance in HRQOL was unexplained, mobility variables were stronger correlates than comorbidity. Taken together with past research, which has demonstrated that loss of mobility predicts loss of independence, mortality, and nursing home admission,⁷ it is clear that interventions that can preserve or improve mobility in older adults could produce increases in both quantity and quality of life.

Acknowledgements

The Lifestyle Interventions and Independence for Elders (LIFE) Pilot Study is funded by a National Institutes on Health/National Institute on Aging Cooperative Agreement #U01 AG22376 and sponsored in part by the Intramural Research Program, National Institute on Aging, NIH.

References

1. Patla AE, Shumway-Cook A. Dimensions of mobility: Defining the complexity and difficulty associated with community mobility. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity* 1999;7(1):7–19.
2. Fried LP, Bandeen-Roche K, Chaves PH, Johnson BA. Preclinical mobility disability predicts incident mobility disability in older women. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2000;55(1):M43–52. [PubMed: 10719772]
3. Guralnik JM, LaCroix AZ, Abbott RD, Berkman LF, Satterfield S, Evans DA, et al. Maintaining mobility in late life. I. Demographic characteristics and chronic conditions. *Am J Epidemiol* 1993;137(8):845–57. [PubMed: 8484376]

4. Ferrucci L, Penninx BW, Leveille SG, Corti MC, Pahor M, Wallace R, et al. Characteristics of nondisabled older persons who perform poorly in objective tests of lower extremity function. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2000;48(9):1102–10. [PubMed: 10983911]
5. Guralnik JM, Ferrucci L, Simonsick EM, Salive ME, Wallace RB. Lower-extremity function in persons over the age of 70 years as a predictor of subsequent disability. *N Engl J Med* 1995;332(9):556–61. [PubMed: 7838189]
6. Guralnik JM, Leveille S, Volpato S, Marx MS, Cohen-Mansfield J. Targeting High-Risk Older Adults Into Exercise Programs for Disability Prevention. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity* 2003;11:219–228.
7. Guralnik JM, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L, Glynn RJ, Berkman LF, Blazer DG, et al. A short physical performance battery assessing lower extremity function: association with self-reported disability and prediction of mortality and nursing home admission. *J Gerontol* 1994;49(2):M85–94. [PubMed: 8126356]
8. Kaplan RM, Bush JW, Berry CC. Health status: types of validity and the index of well-being. *Health Serv Res* 1976;11(4):478–507. [PubMed: 1030700]
9. Stewart AL, Hays RD, Ware JE Jr. The MOS short-form general health survey. Reliability and validity in a patient population. *Med Care* 1988;26(7):724–35. [PubMed: 3393032]
10. The EuroQol Group. EuroQol--a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health Policy* 1990;16(3):199–208. [PubMed: 10109801]
11. Feeny D, Furlong W, Boyle M, Torrance GW. Multi-attribute health status classification systems. Health Utilities Index. *Pharmacoeconomics* 1995;7(6):490–502. [PubMed: 10155335]
12. Kaplan, RM.; Anderson, JP. The quality of well-being scale: Rationale for a single quality of life index. In: Walker, SR.; Rosser, R., editors. Centre for Medicines Research Workshop; 1988. CIBA Foundation; Lancaster, England; Boston: MTP Press; 1988. p. 325
13. Kaplan RM, Sieber WJ, Ganiats TG. The quality of well-being scale: Comparison of the interviewer-administered version with a self-administered questionnaire. *Psych Health* 1997;12:783–791.
14. Fryback DG, Dasbach EJ, Klein R, Klein BE, Dorn N, Peterson K, et al. The Beaver Dam Health Outcomes Study: initial catalog of health-state quality factors. *Med Decis Making* 1993;13(2):89–102. [PubMed: 8483408]
15. Tengs TO, Wallace A. One thousand health-related quality-of-life estimates. *Med Care* 2000;38(6):583–637. [PubMed: 10843310]
16. Ware, JE.; Kosinski, MA.; Keller, SD. SF-36 Physical and Mental Health Summary Scales: A User's Manual. 5th. Boston, MA: Health Assessment Lab, New England Medical Center; 1994.
17. The LIFE Study Investigators. Effects of a physical activity intervention on measures of physical performance: results of the Lifestyle Interventions and Independence for Elders pilot (LIFE-P) study. *Journals of Gerontology: Medical Sciences*. in press
18. Rejeski WJ, Fielding RA, Blair SN, Guralnik JM, Gill TM, Hadley EC, et al. The lifestyle interventions and independence for elders (LIFE) pilot study: design and methods. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2005;26(2):141–54. [PubMed: 15837437]
19. Brawley LR, Rejeski WJ, Lutes L. A group-mediated cognitive-behavioral intervention for increasing adherence to physical activity in older adults. *J of Applied Biobehavioral Research* 2000;5:47–55.
20. Katula J, Kritchevsky SB, Guralnik JM, Glynn NW, Pruitt L, Wallace K, et al. Lifestyle Interventions and Independence for Elders Pilot Study (LIFE-P): Recruitment and Baseline Characteristics. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. in press
21. Simonsick EM, Montgomery PS, Newman AB, Bauer DC, Harris T. Measuring fitness in healthy older adults: the Health ABC Long Distance Corridor Walk. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2001;49(11):1544–8. [PubMed: 11890597]
22. Newman AB, Haggerty CL, Kritchevsky SB, Nevitt MC, Simonsick EM. Walking performance and cardiovascular response: associations with age and morbidity--the Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2003;58(8):715–20. [PubMed: 12902529]
23. Rantanen T, Guralnik JM, Foley D, Masaki K, Leveille S, Curb JD, et al. Midlife hand grip strength as a predictor of old age disability. *Jama* 1999;281(6):558–60. [PubMed: 10022113]

24. Rantanen T, Harris T, Leveille SG, Visser M, Foley D, Masaki K, et al. Muscle strength and body mass index as long-term predictors of mortality in initially healthy men. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2000;55(3):M168–73. [PubMed: 10795731]
25. Sieber WJ, David KM, Adams JE, Kaplan RM, Ganiats TG. Assessing the impact of migraine on health-related quality of life: An additional use of the quality of well-being scale-self-administered. *Headache* 2000;40(8):662–71. [PubMed: 10971663]
26. Kaplan RM, Bush JW. Health-related quality of life measurement for evaluation research and policy analysis. *Health Psychol* 1982;1:61–80.
27. Kaplan, R.; Anderson, J. The general health policy model: an integrated approach. In: Spilker, B., editor. *Quality of life and pharmacoeconomics in clinical trials*. 2nd. Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven; 1996. p. 309-22.
28. Ramsey SD, Sullivan SD, Kaplan RM, Wood DE, Chiang YP, Wagner JL. NETT Research Group. Economic analysis of lung volume reduction surgery as part of the National Emphysema Treatment Trial. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2001;71(3):995–1002. [PubMed: 11269488]
29. DPP. The Diabetes Prevention Program. Design and methods for a clinical trial in the prevention of type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 1999 Apr;22(4):623–34. [PubMed: 10189543]
30. Gohagan JK, Prorok PC, Hayes RB, Kramer BS. The Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial of the National Cancer Institute: history, organization, and status. *Control Clin Trials* 2000;21:251S–272S. [PubMed: 11189683]
31. Frosch DL, Kaplan RM, Ganiats TG, Groessl EJ, Sieber WJ, Weisman MH. Validity of self-administered quality of well-being scale in musculoskeletal disease. *Arthritis Rheum* 2004;51(1):28–33. [PubMed: 14872452]
32. Beusterien KM, Ackerman SJ, Plante K, Glaspy J, Naredi P, Wood D, et al. The health-related quality-of-life impact of histamine dihydrochloride plus interleukin-2 compared with interleukin-2 alone in patients with metastatic melanoma. *Support Care Cancer* 2003;11:304–12. [PubMed: 12720074]
33. Pyne JM, Sieber WJ, David K, Kaplan RM, Hyman Rapaport M, Keith Williams D. Use of the quality of well-being self-administered version (QWB-SA) in assessing health-related quality of life in depressed patients. *J Affect Disord* 2003;76(13):237–47. [PubMed: 12943954]
34. Coffey JT, Brandle M, Zhou H, Marriott D, Burke R, Tabaei BP, et al. Valuing health-related quality of life in diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25(12):2238–43. [PubMed: 12453967]
35. Tabaei BP, Shill-Novak J, Brandle M, Burke R, Kaplan RM, Herman WH. Glycemia and the quality of well-being in patients with diabetes. *Qual Life Res* 2004;13(6):1153–61. [PubMed: 15287281]
36. Rosen PN, Kaplan RM, David K. Measuring outcomes of cataract surgery using the Quality of Well-Being Scale and VF-14 Visual Function Index. *J Cataract Refract Surg* 2005;31(2):369–78. [PubMed: 15767161]
37. Andresen EM, Rothenberg BM, Kaplan RM. Performance of a self-administered mailed version of the Quality of Well-Being (QWB-SA) questionnaire among older adults. *Med Care* 1998;36(9):1349–60. [PubMed: 9749658]
38. Herman WH, Hoerger TJ, Brandle M, Hicks K, Sorensen S, Zhang P, et al. The cost-effectiveness of lifestyle modification or metformin in preventing type 2 diabetes in adults with impaired glucose tolerance. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;142(5):323–32. [PubMed: 15738451]
39. Frosch D, Porzolt F, Heicappell R, Kleinschmidt K, Schatz M, Weinknecht S, et al. Comparison of German language versions of the QWB-SA and SF-36 evaluating outcomes for patients with prostate disease. *Qual Life Res* 2001;10(2):165–73. [PubMed: 11642687]
40. Kaplan RM, Ries AL, Reilly J, Mohsenifar Z. Measurement of health-related quality of life in the national emphysema treatment trial. *Chest* 2004;126(3):781–9. [PubMed: 15364757]
41. Kaplan, RM.; Feeny, D.; Revicki, DA. Methods for assessing relative importance in preference based outcome measures. In: Joyce, CRBE.; Hannah, M.; McGee, E., et al., editors. *Individual Quality of Life: Approaches to Conceptualisation and Assessment*. Amsterdam: 1999. p. 135-149.
42. Kaplan RM. The minimally clinically important difference in generic utility-based measures. *Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease* 2005;2:91–97. [PubMed: 17136968]
43. Ibrahim SA, Burant CJ, Siminoff LA, Stoller EP, Kwok CK. Self-assessed global quality of life: a comparison between African-American and white older patients with arthritis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2002;55(5):512–7. [PubMed: 12007555]

44. Penedo FJ, Dahn JR, Shen BJ, Schneiderman N, Antoni MH. Ethnicity and determinants of quality of life after prostate cancer treatment. *Urology* 2006;67(5):1022–7. [PubMed: 16698362]
45. Groessl EJ, Ganiats TG, Sarkin A. Demographic differences in quality of life assessment in rheumatoid arthritis. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2006;24(2):109–21. [PubMed: 16460133]
46. Reboussin BA, Rejeski WJ, Martin KA, Callahan K, Dunn AL, King AC, et al. Correlates of satisfaction with body function and appearance in middle-aged and older adults: The activity counseling trial. *Psychology and Health* 2000;15:239–254.
47. Groessl EJ, Kaplan RM, Barrett-Connor E, Ganiats TG. Body mass index and quality of well-being in a community of older adults. *Am J Prev Med* 2004;26(2):126–9. [PubMed: 14751323]
48. Hanmer J, Lawrence WF, Anderson JP, Kaplan RM, Fryback DG. Report of Nationally Representative Values for the Noninstitutionalized U.S. Adult Population for 7 Health-Related Quality-of-Life Scores. *Med Decis Making* 2006;26(4):391–400. [PubMed: 16855127]
49. Kaplan RM, Anderson JP, Wingard DL. Gender differences in health-related quality of life. *Health Psychol* 1991;10(2):86–93. [PubMed: 2055214]

Table 1

Participant demographics and descriptive statistics

Variable	Mean [SD] or %
Age (n=424)	76.77 [4.24]
QWB-SA score (n=424)	0.634 [0.099]
Total SPPB score (n=424)	7.52 [1.42]
SPPB Balance Test (n=424)	2.97 [1.07]
SPPB Chair Stand (n=424)	1.36 [0.83]
SPPB Gait Speed (n=424)	3.19 [0.74]
400 m walk time 9 (n=424)	8.17 [1.89]
Comorbidity index (# of conditions) (n =424)	1.71 [1.14]
Grip strength (n=399)	25.2 [8.8]
Gender (n=424)	
Female	68.9%
Education (n=423)	
No college	30.0%
College	45.8%
post college	21.2%
Other	3.0%
Ethnicity (n = 423)	
Caucasian	74.3%
Black	18.2%
Hispanic	4.7%
Other	2.8%
Income (n =354)	
Under \$25,000	34.2%
\$25,000 – 49,999	26.9%
\$50,001 and above	22.4%
Decline to State	16.5%
Marital status (n =423)	
Married	39.4%
Widowed	40.8%
Divorced	14.9%
Never married	3.8%
Other	1.1%

Table 2

A comparison of current study results with mean QWB-SA scores and descriptors for other disease samples.

Sample characteristics	n	Age	% women	QWB-SA mean (SD)
Healthy older adults {Andresen ³⁷ #502}	301	74.7	59	0.704 (.099)
Adults at risk of developing diabetes {Herman ³⁸ #503}	3234	51.2	68	0.681 (.108)
Family medicine outpatients {Frosch ³¹ #284}	562	46.7	57	0.651 (.134)
Older Adults w/ mobility limitations (current study)	424	76.8	69	0.634 (.099)
Migraineurs {Sieber ²⁵ #265} (days without headaches)	89	42.2	87	0.628 (.149)
Cancer patients in Germany {Frosch ³⁹ #490} (prostate, BPH, colon, rectal)	275	66.3	0	0.619 (.150)
Cataract patients {Rosen ³⁶ #497} (directly prior to surgery)	233	72.5	40	0.595 (.134)
Type 1 Diabetes {Coffey ³⁴ #495}	784	34.5	55	0.572 (n/a)
Emphysema patients {Kaplan ⁴⁰ #504} (before pulmonary rehabilitation)	1218	67.0	39	0.571 (.114)
Type 2 Diabetes {Coffey ³⁴ #495}	1257	57.6	49	0.547 (n/a)
Rheumatology patients {Frosch ³¹ #284}	334	55.1	84	0.516 (.130)
Migraineurs {Sieber ²⁵ #265} (days with headache)	89	42.2	87	0.492 (.157)
Major depressive disorder – outpatients {Pyne ³³ #241}	19	43.6	37	0.479 (.112)
Major depressive disorder – inpatients {Pyne ³³ #241}	39	46.7	15	0.383 (.118)

Table 3
Hierarchical regression analysis results – Variables associated with QWB-SA scores at baseline assessment

Parameter	Estimate	Standard error	f value	p value	Tot R ²	R ² change
Step 1-Demographics						
Intercept	0.642	0.044	499.52	<.0001	0.0109	0.0109
White	-.028	0.010	6.30	0.0124		
Step 2 – Comorbidity					0.0413	0.0304
Comorbidity index	-.011	0.004	8.35	0.0041		
Step 3 - Mobility					0.1280	0.0867
400m walk time	-.008	0.003	17.64	<0.0001		
SPPB balance	0.010	0.004	5.42	0.0205		
SPPB chair stands	0.020	0.006	12.82	0.0004		