

1 **Patient-Reported Outcomes of Ugandans Living with**
2 **Autoimmune Rheumatic Diseases**

3
4 ***Short title: PROMs in Rheumatology Clinics in Uganda***

5
6 Felix Bongomin^{1,2*}, MB ChB, M.Sc., FECMM, Maria Sekimpi¹, MB ChB,
7 Barbra Natukunda¹, MB ChB, Anthony Makhoba^{3,4}, MB ChB, M.MED,
8 and Mark Kaddumukasa¹, MB ChB, M.MED, PhD

- 9
10 1. Department of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Makerere University, Kampala,
11 Uganda
12 2. Department of Immunology and Medical Microbiology, Gulu University Medical
13 School, Gulu, Uganda
14 3. Department of Medicine, St. Francis's Hospital- Nsambya, Kampala, Uganda
15 4. Department of Medicine, Mother Kevin Postgraduate Medical School, Uganda
16 Martyrs University, Kampala, Uganda

17
18
19
20 *Correspondence

21 Felix Bongomin, MB ChB, MSc, FECMM
22 Email: drbongomin@gmail.com
23 Tel: + 256 -784-523-395
24

25 **Abstract**

26 **Purpose:** This study aimed to assess the patient-reported outcomes (PROs) in
27 rheumatic patients attending two tertiary rheumatology clinics in Uganda.

28 **Methods:** A cross-sectional, clinical audit of patients aged 16 years or older with a
29 confirmed diagnosis of rheumatic disease and receiving disease modifying anti-
30 rheumatic drugs (DMARDs) was conducted between September and December
31 2020. Health index and overall self-rated health status were assessed using the ED-
32 5D-5L tool. Comparisons for variables was performed using Student's t-test or Mann-
33 Whitney U for continuous numerical data while categorical data was compared using
34 either χ^2 tests or Fisher's exact tests as appropriate.

35 **Results:**

36 We enrolled 74 eligible patients: 48 (64.9%) had rheumatoid arthritis (RA), 14
37 (18.9%) had systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), and 12 (16.2%) had other
38 autoimmune rheumatic disorders. Majority (n=69, 93.2%) were female with a mean
39 \pm SD age of 45 ± 17 years. Fourteen (18.9%) patients were on concomitant herbal
40 medication while using DMARDs and 26 (35.1%) self-reported at least 1 adverse
41 drug reactions to the DMARDs. Any level of problem was reported by 54 (72.5%)
42 participants for mobility, 47 (63.5%) for self-care, 56 (75.6%) for usual activity, 66
43 (89.1%) for pain and discomfort, and 56 (75.6%) for anxiety/depression. Patients
44 with SLE had higher median health index compared to those other autoimmune
45 rheumatic disorders ($p < 0.0001$). Overall self-rated health status was comparable
46 across clinical diagnoses ($p = 0.2$), but better for patients who received care from
47 private (Nsambya Hospital) compared to public hospital (Mulago Hospital) (65 vs. 50,
48 $p = 0.009$).

49 **Conclusion:** There is a substantial negative impact of autoimmune rheumatic
50 diseases on quality of life of patients, especially those receiving care from a public
51 facility in Uganda.

52 **Keywords:** Autoimmune rheumatic diseases, SLE, rheumatoid arthritis, Health
53 index, patient-reported outcomes, DMARDs, Uganda

54

55 **Clinical Significance**

- 56 1. Adverse drug reactions to DMARDs was reported by more than one-third of
57 the patients
- 58 2. SLE patients have better quality of life compared to patients with other
59 autoimmune rheumatic disease.
- 60 3. Concomitant use of herbal medication is common and associated with lower
61 health index and lower overall self-rated health status.
- 62 4. Autoimmune rheumatic diseases impose a heavy financial burden on affected
63 patients, over 70% of the study patients required financial support for
64 management of their disease and a high proportion of these patients were not
65 on their DMARD therapy the week prior to their scheduled clinic appoints.

66

67

68

69

70

71 **Introduction**

72 Autoimmune rheumatic disorders such as rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and systemic
73 lupus erythematosus (SLE) are associated with pain, disability and several co-
74 morbid conditions thus significantly impacting on quality of life and overall wellbeing
75 of the affected individuals and their families.¹ Consequently, higher morbidity and
76 mortality rates are observed among these individuals compared to the general
77 population ^{1,2}. Also, there's a significant individual differences in the day-to-day
78 variability of pain, fatigue, and well-being in patients with rheumatic disease.³
79 Therefore, quality of life is central in the care of patients with autoimmune rheumatic
80 diseases and is an important target in therapeutic advances in rheumatology while
81 evaluating or managing these patients with disease modifying anti-rheumatic drugs
82 (DMARDs) .⁴

83 Patient-reported outcomes (PROs) are patient's perspectives on their disease
84 activity, functional status, and quality of life ⁵. Patient-reported outcome measures
85 (PROMs), are a set of widely available tools directly capture PROs and are
86 increasingly being used in clinical rheumatology practice and in research to help
87 inform patient-centered care and clinical decision-making even among vulnerable
88 rheumatic patients such as those with low health literacy or English proficiency.⁶

89 There are no locally validated rheumatic disease specific PROMs in Africa and data
90 on PROs of patients with rheumatic diseases in Africa is scanty, even though these
91 diseases, especially RA and SLE are increasingly being reported in Africa.⁷⁻⁹ This
92 study aimed to describe PROs of patients with autoimmune rheumatic diseases in
93 two tertiary care centers in Uganda.

94 **Patients and Methods**

95 ***Study design and settings***

96 This descriptive, cross-sectional clinical audit recruited consecutive outpatients
97 attending two rheumatology clinics at Mulago National Referral Hospital (Mulago
98 Hospital), Kampala, Uganda and St. Francis's Hospital-Nsambya, Kampala, Uganda
99 (Nsambya Hospital) between September and December 2020. Mulago Hospital,
100 located in the capital city, Kampala, is the largest public health facility in Uganda

101 serving as a national super-specialized hospital with over 1,000-bed capacity.
102 Nsambya Hospital is a faith-based, private-not-for-profit hospital also located in
103 Kampala, Uganda.

104 ***Study population***

105 Patients aged 16 years or older with a diagnosis of an autoimmune rheumatologic
106 disease diagnosed by one of the two experienced rheumatologists (AM and MK) for
107 whom at least one of the DMARDs was prescribed in their last previous clinic visit
108 constituted the study population.

109 ***Data collection***

110 Data were collected using semi-structured questionnaires administered by the
111 treating physicians (the authors) during routine clinical care. This audit was
112 anonymous, consisted of semi-structured questions, which were available only in
113 English. Data was collected on the following parameters: (1) patient socio-
114 demographic characteristics: age, gender, marital status, level of education, current
115 employment status, monthly income and financial support from family members; (2)
116 Clinical diagnosis: duration of illness, self-reported disease severity, disease flares,
117 hospitalization and family history of autoimmune disease; (3) Medication: DMARDs
118 used, duration of therapy, source of DMARDs, monthly expenditure on DMARDs,
119 satisfaction with treatment, concomitant use of herbal medication, adverse drug
120 reactions; (4) Number of additional medications used daily; and (5) co-morbidities

121 ***Patient-reported outcome measure***

122 The EQ-5D-5L, a standardized instrument for use as a measure of health outcomes
123 consisting of 5 dimensions and 5 levels was administered to the participants¹⁰. The
124 tool has been previously used in sub-Saharan Africa and is being validated in
125 Ethiopia^{11,12}. The 5 dimensions assessed were mobility, self-care, usual activities,
126 pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression. Each dimension has five levels (no
127 problems, slight problems, moderate problems, severe problems, extreme
128 problems/unable to). Health state profile was generated from these dimensions and
129 levels. Overall self-rated health status was assessed using the visual analogue scale

130 (VAS) on which the patient rates his/her perceived health from 0 (the worst
131 imaginable health) to 100 (the best imaginable health).

132 **Data analysis**

133 Baseline characteristics were summarized using medians and ranges or means and
134 standard deviations (SD) for continuous variables and frequencies and percentages
135 for categorical variables. Comparisons for variables were performed using Student's
136 t-test or Mann-Whitney U (for two group comparisons) and the one-way analysis of
137 variance or Kruskal-Wallis (for more than two group comparisons) for continuous
138 numerical data. Categorical data were compared using either χ^2 tests or Fisher's
139 exact tests as appropriate. Health state index scores generally range from less than
140 0 (where 0 is the value of a health state equivalent to dead; negative values
141 representing values as worse than dead) to 1 (the value of full health) were
142 calculated from individual health profiles using crosswalk value sets for Zimbabwe
143 (Reference). Statistical analyses were performed using STATA 16.0 and GraphPad
144 Prism 8.0. A $p < 0.05$ was considered to indicate statistical significance.

145 **Ethical considerations**

146 This was a clinical audit, evaluating standard of care of patients in our clinics. All
147 patients provided written informed consent and the study protocol was in compliance
148 with the ethical guidelines of the *Declarations of Helsinki*.

149 **Results**

150 **Sociodemographic characteristics**

151 A total of 74 eligible patients were studied: 41 (55.4%) from Mulago Hospital and 33
152 (44.6%) from Nsambya Hospital. Majority were female (n=69, 93.2%) with a mean
153 \pm SD age of 45 ± 17 years. Thirty-one (41.9%) patients were single, 29 (39.1%) had
154 received tertiary education and 49 (66.2%) were not formally employed. The median
155 (range) monthly income was 300,000 (30,000 – 1,000, 000) Ugandan shillings
156 (UGX). Fifty-five (74.3%) participants received financial support from their children
157 (n=18, 24.3%), other family members (n=15, 20.3%), their spouses (n=12, 16.2%),
158 their parents (n=7, 9.5%) or from the church (n=3, 4.1%), **Table 1**.

159 **Clinical characteristics**

160 Forty-eight (64.9%) patients had RA, 14 (18.9%) had SLE, and 12 (16.2%) had other
161 rheumatic disorders namely spondyloarthritis (n=5), systemic sclerosis (n=3),
162 juvenile idiopathic arthritis (n=2), and inflammatory myopathy (n=2). The median
163 (range) duration of illness was 48 (2-420) months. On the day of the clinic visit,
164 patients' self-rated severity of their illnesses was as follows: Controlled (n=10,
165 13.5%), mild (n=18, 24.3%), moderate (n=29, 39.2%), severe (n=12, 16.2%), and
166 very severe (n=5, 6.8%). The median (range) episodes of disease flares in the past 3
167 months was 1 (range: 0- 20). Thirty-two (43.2%) patients had at least one co-
168 morbidity. Of these, 23 (71.9%) were RA patients, 4 (12.5%) were SLE and 5
169 (15.6%) were patients who had other clinical diagnoses.

170 **Disease modifying anti-rheumatic drug therapy**

171 None of the patients was on biologic DMARDs. Majority of the patients with RA were
172 on monotherapy of methotrexate (n=23, 47.9%), those with SLE were mostly either
173 on monotherapy of hydroxychloroquine or in a combination with azathioprine (n= 12,
174 85.7%), and half of patients with other rheumatic diseases were either on
175 azathioprine or sulfasalazine (n=6, 50%), **Table 1**. The median duration of DMARD
176 therapy was 12 (range: 1-24) months. All 41 patients from Mulago Hospital bought
177 their DMARDs from private pharmacies. On the other hand, 16/33 patients from
178 Nsambya Hospital bought their DMARDs from the hospital pharmacy, 13/33 from
179 private pharmacies and 4 from either private pharmacies or Nsambya Hospital
180 pharmacy. The median (range) monthly cost of DMARDs was 120,000 (12,800 –
181 2,000,000) UGX. Sixty-four (86.4%) participants reported satisfaction with DMARD
182 treatment. However, 14 (18.9%) participants were on concomitant herbal medication
183 while using DMARDs. Twenty-six (35.1%) participants reported at least 1 adverse
184 drug reactions (ADRs) to the DMARDs. Most ADRs were observed with
185 methotrexate (10/26; 4 patients reported dizziness, 3 weakness, 2 gastrointestinal
186 (GI) disturbances and 1 pulmonary fibrosis), hydroxychloroquine (8/26: 1 visual
187 impairment, 2 rashes, and 5 dizziness), sulfasalazine (4/26: 1 nightmare, 3 GI
188 disturbance), azathioprine (3/26; all 3 reported weakness), and 1 patient reported
189 diarrhea while on mycophenolate mofetil.

190 Twenty-one (28.4%) patients, most of whom were attending Mulago Hospital
191 Rheumatology Clinic (18/21 (86%) vs. 3/21 (14%), $p=0.01$) were off DMARDs in the
192 week prior to clinic visit.

193 **Health profiles and overall health status**

194 Table 3 and Table 4 summarizes the health indices and overall self-rated health
195 status of the participants across sociodemographic and clinical characteristics.
196 Regarding the health profiles of the participants, 71 (96%) participants reported at
197 least one activity limitation. Any level of problem was reported by 54 (72.5%)
198 participants for mobility, 47 (63.5%) for self-care, 56 (75.6%) for usual activity, 66
199 (89.1%) for pain and discomfort, and 56 (75.6%) for anxiety/depression. The median
200 health index was 0.675 (range: 0.163 – 0.9). Both health index and overall self-rated
201 health status were higher for patients who received care from Nsambya Hospital
202 compared to Mulago Hospital (0.718 vs. 0.585, $p<0.0001$) and (63.6 vs. 53.7,
203 $p<0.0001$), respectively **Table 3 and 4**. Also, patients with SLE had higher median
204 health index compared to those with RA or other rheumatic disease, **Table 3**.
205 Patients who reported controlled or mild disease, and those who reported
206 satisfaction with medical (DMARDs) therapy had higher health indices and higher
207 overall self-rated health status (all p -values <0.001), **Table 3 and 4**. Conversely,
208 patients who reported concomitant herbal medication use had lower health index
209 (0.558 vs. 0.664, $p=0.03$) and lower overall self-rated health status (47.6 vs. 60.5,
210 $p=0.01$) compared to those who did not report use of herbal medications, **Table 3**
211 **and 4**. There was a trend towards patients with co-morbidities having a better overall
212 self-reported health status compared to those without co-morbidities (58.6 vs. 57.7,
213 $p=0.05$), **Table 4**.

214

215

216

217 Discussion

218 Understanding PROs influence treatment decisions and inform clinical care in
219 patients with autoimmune rheumatic disease.^{13,14} In the present study, among
220 Ugandan patients with autoimmune rheumatic diseases, over 95% of the patients
221 reported at least one activity limitation. This finding is consistent with the 2020
222 American College of Rheumatology (ACR) patients survey, where about 83% of
223 people living with a rheumatic disease reported at least one activity limitation as a
224 result of their disease, including ability to exercise, work, and perform physical
225 activities.¹⁵ Our findings suggest that patients with SLE have a better quality of life
226 compared to patients with other autoimmune rheumatic diseases which is in line with
227 prior investigation.¹⁶ Contrastingly, a recent study from Kenya showed that patients
228 with SLE had significantly low health-related quality of life.¹⁷ This is probably
229 because the Kenyan patients had more severe disease, though much younger age
230 than our population. Remarkably, participants with duration of illness of 4 years or
231 less and those who were on DMARDs for less than 1 year had higher health indices.
232 Equally remarkably, overall self-rated health status was comparable across groups
233 and sub groups of illness duration and duration of uninterrupted DMARDs therapy.

234 Age, disease severity and co-morbidities are important predictors of quality of life of
235 patients with autoimmune diseases.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ Thus it was not surprising that in our study,
236 patients with controlled or mild disease and those who reported satisfaction with
237 DMARDs had higher health indices and high self-rated health status. Current
238 rheumatic management guidance emphasizes the treat-to-target approach, as
239 patients in remission or low disease activity tends to have a better quality of life
240 indices¹⁴. However, access and affordability of both conventional and biologic
241 DMARDs remains a challenge worldwide.^{15,20} indeed, none of our study participants
242 was on a biologic DMARDs. Lack of access to and non-affordability of DMARDs
243 have negative association with disease activity and a poorer quality of life.²⁰ This is
244 evident in our study where patients attending care in a private hospital with better
245 access to DMARDs had better health indices and overall self-rated health status.

246 DMARDs are expensive and are unaffordable by most patients. In the 2020 ACR
247 patient survey, the median annual out-of-pocket spending on treatment for rheumatic
248 disease was \$1,000 per year.¹⁵ On average, out-of-pocket expenditure on DMARDs

249 of our patients was about \$400 per year. This is quite high and explains the high
250 proportion of patients not being on their DMARDs the week prior to their scheduled
251 clinic appoints. In Uganda, much as DMARDs such as methotrexate are on the
252 essential medicine list, they are not routinely available for the care of patients with
253 rheumatic diseases. The heavy financial burden of these diseases and their
254 management explains the huge need for financial support observed in over 70% of
255 our patients. Consequently, patients who are wealthier or have health insurance
256 services are able to access these medicines in private settings and have better
257 adherence and health outcomes as observed in one of the centres in the present
258 study.

259 One in every 5 patients with rheumatic disease in our cohort reported concomitant
260 use of herbal medication. Regrettably, this was associated with lower health index
261 and lower overall self-rated health status. Despite the fact that ADRs were similar
262 among those who were on herbal medications and those not using herbs, these
263 findings should encourage clinicians to always assess for herbal medication use
264 among these patients and provide appropriate counseling. However, it is unclear
265 whether the poor quality of life of patients on concomitant herbal medication was
266 truly due to negative impacts of herbal medicines on rheumatic diseases or because
267 patients who showed poor response while on DMARDs had uncontrolled disease
268 and therefore sought for herbal remedy for a better disease control. Herbal
269 medication use remains an area of further research among these patients. Known
270 beneficial add-on therapy in patients with rheumatic diseases revolves around
271 optimization of the management of underlying co-morbidities, physical and
272 occupational therapies.¹⁵

273 Our study has some important limitations. Firstly, we were unable to assess disease
274 specific severity for the different rheumatic diseases. However, we were able to elicit
275 patients-reported disease severity which fairly correlates with disease severity
276 scores. Secondly, we were unable to formally assess for medication adherence
277 using validated tools due to lack of access to license. Thirdly, we were unable to use
278 disease specific health-related outcome measures such as LupusQoL.¹⁶ However,
279 ED-5D-5L has been shown to be a reliable tool for these group of patients.²¹ Lastly,
280 measurements of test–retest reliability were not done because patients were

281 assessed on only one clinic visit. However, this the first study from Uganda and one
282 of the few in the region to report on quality of life of patients with autoimmune
283 rheumatic diseases receiving DMARDs. Future studies would aim at correlating
284 health indices with disease severity and medication adherence in our setting. At
285 policy level, we need to identify strategies to widely increase availability; accessibility
286 and affordability of DMARDs in Uganda should be explored. It's timely to welcome
287 clinical trials on biologic DMARDs for our patients to evaluate short- and long-term
288 outcomes.

289 **CONCLUSION**

290 In conclusion, over 95% of Ugandan patients with autoimmune rheumatic diseases
291 on DMARDs have at least one activity limitation. SLE patients have better quality of
292 life compared to patients with RA or rheumatic disease. Concomitant use of herbal
293 medication is common and associated with lower health index and lower overall self-
294 rated health status.

295 **Acknowledgement**

296 Mark Kaddumukasa is supported by a grant from the National Institutes Health
297 (K43TW010401 NINDS and Fogarty International Center (FIC). We are indebted to
298 our patients who have become a significant part of us and through whom we are
299 able to enjoy the practice of clinical rheumatology. We appreciate the administrative
300 support from the study sites.

301 **Authors' contribution**

302 All authors significantly contributed to the conceptualization, design, data collection,
303 analysis and interpretation and drafting of the manuscript. The final manuscript was
304 read and approved by all authors.

305 **Competing interests**

306 All authors have no conflict of interest to declare

307 **Funding**

308 None

309

310

311 References

- 312 1. Zochling J, Braun J. Mortality in rheumatoid arthritis and ankylosing spondylitis. *Clin*
313 *Exp Rheumatol*. 2009;27(4 SUPPL. 55):S127-30.
314 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19822059>
- 315 2. Gabriel SE, Michaud K. Epidemiological studies in incidence, prevalence, mortality,
316 and comorbidity of the rheumatic diseases. *Arthritis Res Ther*. 2009;11(3):229.
317 doi:10.1186/ar2669
- 318 3. Schneider S, Junghaenel DU, Keefe FJ, Schwartz JE, Stone AA, Broderick JE.
319 Individual differences in the day-to-day variability of pain, fatigue, and well-being in
320 patients with rheumatic disease: Associations with psychological variables. *Pain*.
321 2012;153(4):813-822. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2012.01.001
- 322 4. Burmester GR, Bijlsma JWJ, Cutolo M, McInnes IB. Managing rheumatic and
323 musculoskeletal diseases — past, present and future. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*.
324 2017;13(7):443-448. doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2017.95
- 325 5. US Food & Drug Administration. Patient-reported outcome measures: use in medical
326 product development to support labeling claims. Published 2009. Accessed
327 December 13, 2020. [https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/patient-reported-outcome-measures-use-medical-product-development-support-labeling-claims)
328 [documents/patient-reported-outcome-measures-use-medical-product-development-](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/patient-reported-outcome-measures-use-medical-product-development-support-labeling-claims)
329 [support-labeling-claims](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/patient-reported-outcome-measures-use-medical-product-development-support-labeling-claims)
- 330 6. Carvajal Bedoya G, Davis LA, Hirsh JM. Patient-Reported Outcomes in
331 Rheumatology Patients With Limited English Proficiency and Limited Health Literacy.
332 *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2020;72(S10):738-749. doi:10.1002/acr.24243
- 333 7. Phuti A, Schneider M, Makan K, Tikly M, Hodgkinson B. Living with systemic lupus
334 erythematosus in South Africa: A bitter pill to swallow. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*.
335 2019;17(1). doi:10.1186/s12955-019-1132-y
- 336 8. Usenbo A, Kramer V, Young T, Musekiwa A. Prevalence of Arthritis in Africa: A
337 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Nurmohamed M, ed. *PLoS One*.
338 2015;10(8):e0133858. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133858
- 339 9. Bongomin F, Sekimpi M, Kaddumukasa M. Clinical and immunological characteristics
340 of 56 patients with systemic lupus erythematosus in Uganda. *Rheumatol Adv Pract*.
341 2020;4(1). doi:10.1093/rap/rkaa011
- 342 10. EuroQol - a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health*
343 *Policy (New York)*. 1990;16(3):199-208. doi:10.1016/0168-8510(90)90421-9
- 344 11. Sibhat SG, Fenta TG, Sander B, Gebretekle GB. Health-related quality of life and its
345 predictors among patients with breast cancer at Tikur Anbessa Specialized Hospital,
346 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2019;17(1):165.
347 doi:10.1186/s12955-019-1239-1
- 348 12. Welie AG, Gebretekle GB, Stolk E, et al. Valuing Health State: An EQ-5D-5L Value
349 Set for Ethiopians. *Value Heal Reg Issues*. 2020;22:7-14.
350 doi:10.1016/j.vhri.2019.08.475
- 351 13. Fanouriakis A, Kostopoulou M, Alunno A, et al. 2019 Update of the EULAR
352 recommendations for the management of systemic lupus erythematosus. *Ann Rheum*
353 *Dis*. 2019;78(6):736-745. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-215089
- 354 14. Aringer M, Costenbader K, Daikh D, et al. 2019 European League Against
355 Rheumatism/American College of Rheumatology classification criteria for systemic
356 lupus erythematosus. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2019;78(9):1151-1159.

- 357 doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-214819
- 358 15. ACR. 2020 Rheumatic Disease Patient Survey Results. Access, Affordability &
359 Lifestyle Challenges for Americans Living with Rheumatic Disease.
360 simpletasks.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/ACR-Survey-2020.pdf
- 361 16. Greenfield J, Hudson M, Vinet E, et al. A comparison of health-related quality of life
362 (HRQoL) across four systemic autoimmune rheumatic diseases (SARDs). Abu-
363 Shakra M, ed. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(12):e0189840. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0189840
- 364 17. Nyambane E, Genga E, Achieng L, Oyoo O, Otieno FC. Assessment of disease
365 activity and health related quality of life in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus
366 at Kenyatta national hospital. *African J Rheumatol*. 2020;(9.1):A121.2-A122.
367 doi:10.1136/lupus-2020-eurolupus.230
- 368 18. Fanouriakis A, Kostopoulou M, Alunno A, et al. 2019 Update of the EULAR
369 recommendations for the management of systemic lupus erythematosus. *Ann Rheum*
370 *Dis*. 2019;78(6):736-745. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-215089
- 371 19. Wade S, Tikly M, Hopley M. Causes and predictors of death in South Africans with
372 systemic lupus erythematosus. *Rheumatology*. 2007;46(9):1487-1491.
373 doi:10.1093/rheumatology/kem180
- 374 20. Bergstra SA, Branco JC, Vega-Morales D, et al. Inequity in access to bDMARD care
375 and how it influences disease outcomes across countries worldwide: results from the
376 METEOR-registry. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2018;77(10):1413-1420.
377 doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-213289
- 378 21. Zhang L, Luan W, Geng S, et al. Lack of patient education is risk factor of disease
379 flare in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus in China. *BMC Health Serv Res*.
380 2019;19(1):378. doi:10.1186/s12913-019-4206-y

381

382

383

384

385

386

387 **Tables**

388 **Table 1: Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the participants**

Variable	Freq (%)
Centre, n=74	
Mulago Hospital	41 (55.4)
Nsambya Hospital	33 (44.6)
Age, mean \pmSD years	
≤ 45	39 (52.7)
> 45	35 (47.3)
Sex, n=74	
Female	69 (93.2)
Male	5 (6.8)
Marital status, n=74	
Single	31 (41.9)
Married	22 (29.7)
Widow/er	13 (17.6)
Divorced	8 (10.8)
Education level, n=74	
Informal	6 (8.1)
Primary	21 (28.4)
Secondary	18 (24.3)
Tertiary	29 (39.2)
Employment, n=74	
Formal	25 (33.8)
Informal	49 (66.2)
Financial support, n=74	
Yes	55 (74.3)
No	19 (25.7)
Clinical diagnosis, n=74	
RA	48 (64.9)
SLE	14 (18.9)
Others	12 (16.2)
Duration of illness, median, range (months)	
≤ 48	40 (54.1)
> 48	34 (45.9)
Self-reported disease severity, n=74	
Controlled	10 (13.5)
Mild	18 (24.3)
Moderate	29 (39.2)
Severe	12 (16.2)
Very severe	5 (6.8)
Satisfaction with medical treatment	
Yes	65 (87.8)
No	9 (12.2)
Use of Herbal medication	
Yes	14 (18.9)
No	60 (81.1)
Adverse drug reactions	
Yes	26 (35.1)
No	48 (64.9)
Charlson co-morbidity index, median , range	
Hypertension	2 (1-11)
	22 (29.7)

HIV	3 (4.1)
Chronic Heart Failure	3 (4.1)
Diabetes	3 (4.1)
Treatment regimen by diagnosis, n=74	
Rheumatoid arthritis, n=48	
Methotrexate alone	23 (47.9)
Hydroxychloroquine alone	8 (16.7)
Hydroxychloroquine + Methotrexate	8 (16.7)
Methotrexate + Lefluonimide	6 (12.5)
Hydroxychloroquine + azathioprine	2 (4.2)
Hydroxychloroquine + Methotrexate + Lefluonimide	1 (2.1)
SLE, n=14	
Hydroxychloroquine + azathioprine	8 (57.1)
Hydroxychloroquine alone	4 (28.6)
Hydroxychloroquine + Mycophenolate mofetil	2 (14.3)
Others autoimmune rheumatic diseases, n=12	
Azathioprine alone	3 (25.0)
Sulfasalazine alone	3 (25.0)
Hydroxychloroquine alone	1 (8.3)
Hydroxychloroquine + azathioprine	1 (8.3)
Hydroxychloroquine + Methotrexate	1 (8.3)
Hydroxychloroquine + Sulfasalazine	1 (8.3)
Methotrexate alone	1 (8.3)
Methotrexate + Sulfasalazine	1(8.3)
Source of DMARDS, n=74	
Private pharmacy	54 (73.0)
Nsambya Hospital	16 (26.6)
Nsambya Hospital + private pharmacy	4 (5.4%)
Duration of uninterrupted DMARD therapy, median, Range (months)	
≤12	45 (60.8)
>12	29 (39.2)
Off DMARDs in the last one week	
Yes	21 (28.4)
No	53 (71.6)

389

390

391 **Table 2: EQ-5D-5L frequencies and proportions reported by dimension and level**

	MOBILITY N (%)	SELF-CARE N (%)	USUAL ACTIVITIES N (%)	PAIN/DISCOMFORT N (%)	ANXIETY/DEPRESSION N (%)
LEVEL 1 NO PROBLEMS	20 (27.0)	27 (36.5)	18 (24.3)	8 (10.8)	18 (24.3)
LEVEL 2 SLIGHT PROBLEMS	26 (35.1)	23 (31.1)	26 (35.1)	23 (31.1)	26 (35.1)
LEVEL 3 MODERATE PROBLEMS	15 (20.3)	15 (20.3)	20 (27.0)	26 (35.1)	20 (27.0)
LEVEL 4 SEVERE PROBLEMS	12 (16.2)	8 (10.8)	6 (8.1)	17 (23)	8 (10.8)
LEVEL 5 EXTREME PROBLEMS/UNABLE TO DO	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	4 (5.4)	0 (0)	2 (2.7)
TOTAL	74 (100)	74 (100)	74 (100)	74 (100)	74 (100)

392

393

394

395 **Table 3: Health indices of the participants across sociodemographic and clinical**
 396 **characteristics**

Variable	Freq (%)	Health index Mean (SD)	p-value
ALL, n=74	74 (100%)	0.644 ± 0.164	-
Centre, n=74			
Mulago Hospital	41 (55.4)	0.585 ± 0.177	<0.0001
Nsambya Hospital	33 (44.6)	0.718 ± 0.110	
Age, year			
≤45	39 (52.7)	0.657 ± 0.138	0.516
>45	35 (47.3)	0.632 ± 0.185	
Sex, n=74			
Female	69 (93.2)	0.637 ± 0.162	0.160
Male	5 (6.8)	0.744 ± 0.177	
Marital status, n=74			
Single	31 (41.9)	0.673 ± 0.169	0.633
Married	22 (29.7)	0.629 ± 0.144	
Widow/er	13 (17.6)	0.611 ± 0.212	
Divorced	8 (10.8)	0.628 ± 0.105	
Education level, n=74			
Informal	6 (8.1)	0.675 ± 0.139	0.227
Primary	21 (28.4)	0.594 ± 0.162	
Secondary	18 (24.3)	0.625 ± 0.169	
Tertiary	29 (39.2)	0.686 ± 0.162	
Employment, n=74			
Formal	25 (33.8)	0.672 ± 0.172	0.302
Informal	49 (66.2)	0.630 ± 0.159	
Financial support, n=74			
Yes	55 (74.3)	0.637 ± 0.161	0.528
No	19 (25.7)	0.665 ± 0.665	
Clinical diagnosis, n=74			
RA	48 (64.9)	0.601 ± 0.173	0.007
SLE	14 (18.9)	0.738 ± 0.121	
Others	12 (16.2)	0.704 ± 0.097	
Duration of illness, median, range (months), n=74			
≤48	40 (54.1)	0.682 ± 0.125	0.029
> 48	34 (45.9)	0.599 ± 0.193	
Self-reported disease severity, n=74			
Controlled	10 (13.5)	0.740 ± 0.112	<0.0001
Mild	18 (24.3)	0.719 ± 0.120	
Moderate	29 (39.2)	0.650 ± 0.158	
Severe	12 (16.2)	0.467 ± 0.090	
Very severe	5 (6.8)	0.572 ± 0.234	
Satisfaction with medical treatment			
Yes	65 (87.8)	0.668 ± 0.145	0.001
No	9 (12.2)	0.472 ± 0.194	
Use of Herbal medication			
Yes	14 (18.9)	0.558 ± 0.231	0.03
No	60 (81.1)	0.664 ± 0.139	
Adverse drug reactions			
Yes	26 (35.1)	0.627 ± 0.181	0.516
No	48 (64.9)	0.653 ± 0.155	

Co-morbidity			
Yes	32 (43.2)	0.642 ± 0.170	0.91
No	42 (56.8)	0.646 ± 0.161	
Source of DMARDS, n=74			
Private pharmacy	54 (73.0)	0.644 ± 0.164	0.196
Nsambya Hospital	16 (26.6)	0.709 ± 0.099	
Nsambya Hospital + private pharmacy	4 (5.4%)	0.649 ± 0.102	
Duration of uninterrupted DMARD therapy, median, Range (months), n=74			
≤12	45 (60.8)	0.675 ± 0.133	0.042
>12	29 (39.2)	0.594 ± 0.195	
Off DMARDs in the last one week			
Yes	21 (28.4)	0.622 ± 0.185	0.771
No	53 (71.6)	0.652 ± 0.180	

397

398 **Table 4: Overall self-rated health status of the participants across**
 399 **sociodemographic and clinical characteristics**

Variable	Freq (%)	Overall self-rated health status Mean (SD)	p-value
ALL, n=74	74 (100%)	58.1 ± 16.7	-
Centre, n=74			
Mulago Hospital	41 (55.4)	53.7 ± 17.2	0.01
Nsambya Hospital	33 (44.6)	63.6 ± 14.3	
Age, year			
≤45	35 (47.3)	58.6 ± 15.6	0.823
>45	39 (52.7)	57.7 ± 17.8	
Sex, n=74			
Female	69 (93.2)	57.6 ± 16.6	0.342
Male	5 (6.8)	65.0 ± 18.0	
Marital status, n=74			
Single	31 (41.9)	57.1 ± 18.9	0.874
Married	22 (29.7)	59.8 ± 15.7	
Widow/er	13 (17.6)	59.6 ± 15.9	
Divorced	8 (10.8)	55.0 ± 12.8	
Education level, n=74			
Informal	6 (8.1)	60.8 ± 20.1	0.849
Primary	21 (28.4)	55.5 ± 14.0	
Secondary	18 (24.3)	59.4 ± 16.2	
Tertiary	29 (39.2)	58.6 ± 18.6	
Employment, n=74			
Formal	25 (33.8)	61.0 ± 16.6	0.290
Informal	49 (66.2)	56.6 ± 16.7	
Financial support, n=74			
Yes	55 (74.3)	58.2 ± 16.9	0.949
No	19 (25.7)	57.9 ± 16.4	
Duration of illness, median, range (months), n=74			
≤48	40 (54.1)	61.3 ± 15.4	0.079
> 48	34 (45.9)	54.4 ± 17.5	
Clinical diagnosis, n=74			
RA	48 (64.9)	55.7 ± 17.4	0.225
SLE	14 (18.9)	63.9 ± 17.0	
Others	12 (16.2)	60.8 ± 11.4	
Self-reported disease severity, n=74			
Controlled	10 (13.5)	72.5 ± 14.4	<0.0001
Mild	18 (24.3)	65.0 ± 13.1	
Moderate	29 (39.2)	55.5 ± 15.2	
Severe	12 (16.2)	45.0 ± 15.5	
Very severe	5 (6.8)	51.0 ± 15.6	
Satisfaction with medical treatment			
Yes	65 (87.8)	60.8 ± 15.0	<0.0001
No	9 (12.2)	38.9 ± 16.4	
Use of Herbal medication			
Yes	14 (18.9)	47.9 ± 23.2	0.01
No	60 (81.1)	60.5 ± 14.0	
Adverse drug reactions			

Yes	26 (35.1)	57.9 ± 13.4	0.933
No	48 (64.9)	58.2 ± 18.3	
Co-morbidity			
Yes	32 (43.2)	58.6 ± 17.7	0.05
No	42 (56.8)	57.7 ± 16.1	
Source of DMARDS, n=74			
Private pharmacy	54 (73.0)	55.7 ± 17.0	0.829
Nsambya Hospital	16 (26.6)	66.3 ± 14.9	
Nsambya Hospital + private pharmacy	4 (5.4%)	58.8 ± 10.3	
Duration of uninterrupted DMARD therapy, median, Range (months), n=74			
≤12	45 (60.8)	57.8 ± 15.4	0.922
>12	29 (39.2)	58.2 ± 20.0	
Off DMARDS in the last one week			
Yes	21 (28.4)	58.1 ± 21.5	0.817
No	53 (71.6)	59.4 ± 11.0	

400

401