

# **Gynaecological disease in developing countries: Whose burden?**

**R William Stones and Zoë Matthews**

‘Opportunities and Choices’ Reproductive Health Research  
Southampton Social Statistics Research Institute  
University of Southampton

*Correspondence:*

Dr RW Stones  
Level F (815)  
Princess Anne Hospital  
Southampton SO16 5YA  
UK

Opportunities and Choices Working Paper
---

Voice 023 8079 6033  
Fax 023 8078 6933  
Email: [rws1@soton.ac.uk](mailto:rws1@soton.ac.uk)

## Summary

While maternal mortality represents a readily identifiable outcome measure for women's health, estimating the burden of gynaecological disease is more problematic. However, the importance of including gynaecology and care for non-pregnant women within the remit of Primary Health Care has been suggested more than a decade ago. Since then, various studies have used self report in population based morbidity surveys, purposive laboratory studies and 'syndromic' approaches to estimate prevalence rates. Routine health facility data, although flawed, represent another complimentary source. For policy development, a critical overview is required to identify firstly the extent of a systematic list of gynaecological conditions, and secondly the social burden of these diseases which clearly have an impact on the quality of the lives of women in developing countries. A prototype categorization of gynaecological conditions relevant to the developing world is presented.

As examples, menorrhagia is identified as a common but usually non lethal problem with an impact on general health because of associated anaemia. Cervical cancer is uncommon but lethal, and potentially amenable to mortality reduction through early case finding or screening interventions. Uterine fibroids and prolapse are of interest as conditions showing marked ethnic variation. We suggest an approach to the application of the above overview, highlighting the extent of the disease burden currently borne by women in the developing world, whose impact is potentially obscured by an exclusive consideration of mortality data. Lack of appropriate categorisation and data collection represents a serious barrier to the implementation of policy and services directed towards reproductive health.

## 1. Introduction

16 years ago Rosenfield and Maine ‘put the M back into MCH’, giving women’s health a new place; worthy of study in its own right (Rosenfield and Maine, 1985). Four years later Bang and colleagues brought gynaecological morbidity to international attention by the publication of extremely high prevalence rates in rural India and a call to give more attention to the health of non-pregnant women by including gynaecology in Primary Health Care (Bang et al, 1989). This study inspired several subsequent investigations in other developing country settings, all pointing to the low level of met need for health services and the ‘culture of silence’ which prevents women from seeking health care for gynaecological problems (Bulut, Dixon-Mueller, Bhatia et al, Younis et al). However, most of the conditions that can be categorised as “gynaecological disease” remain unquantified in the WHO Global Burden of Disease (GBD) calculations for reproductive health (Murray & Lopez 1998). Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, apart from some notable qualitative studies (Bang and Bang 1994, Oomman, 2000) there are still very few evaluations of the social burden associated with gynaecological disease. This aspect of women’s health and the importance of social contexts and correlates did not go unnoticed by analysts during the last decade with the prevailing emphasis on women’s powerlessness and the links with reproductive health (Cairo Plan of Action 1994). However, health services and health personnel training in developing countries remain poorly attuned to these problems, and maternal mortality remains as the sole indicator of women’s reproductive health to be found among the international development targets.

Part of the problem is that list of conditions considered under the heading of gynaecological disease is extremely variable. Associated or underlying morbidities are similarly not systematised. Furthermore, an emphasis on studies designed to estimate prevalence has obscured the need also to study determinants and consequences for women – both social and physical. Apart from suffering from a lack of consistent definitions, prevalence estimations have also been undermined by the variability between testing techniques, inconsistency of physician diagnoses, and the poor performance of self report as a tool to predict biomedically defined disease given a disease profile which is often asymptomatic. However, the body of knowledge on instruments for self-reported morbidity is now broad enough for comparative studies to yield useful approaches (cf Koenig et al 1998) and the improvement in affordable laboratory diagnostics holds promise for more systematic and influential information to be produced in the near future.

After an initial justification for the pursuit of quantitative as well as qualitative measures of gynaecological disease, this paper has three aims:

1. We offer a critique of the DALY approach in relation to gynaecological morbidity, criticising both the methodology as applied to morbidities with a strong social component, and also the omission of some key gynaecological conditions from any of the previously calculated disease groups.

2. A summary of findings is presented on physician diagnosis, and self report, syndromic approaches and an update on affordable lab testing appropriate in community studies and also for clinical settings in resource poor areas.

3. As no study ever has the same definition of gynaecological disease, we aim to enumerate an exhaustive list based on the International Classification of Diseases. Although this is a predominantly biomedically determined initial approach, we argue that building a consistent list can only begin here – then extensively tested ‘quality of life’ indicators should be used to understand these conditions in relation to the associated physical and mental distress as suffered by women. We therefore advocate a biomedical list built on by a quantitative as well as qualitative assessment of women’s loss of quality of life.

“Gynaecological disease” covers a range of conditions with a wide spectrum of lethality and chronicity and a substantial impact on women’s quality of life. Racial and geographic variations in disease and social conditions mean that biomedical as well as social science perspectives should come together in providing consistent information for policymakers on this important aspect of women’s health.

## **2. Policy background: Why seek to provide quantitative measures of gynaecological disease?**

Various studies have sought to quantify the burden of gynaecological disease in order to influence policy. Those in India (Bang and Bang 1994, Bhatia et al, 1997) and the Arab world (Younis et al., 1993, Zurayk, et al., 1993) led the field in regions where the ‘culture of silence’ among women was likely to imply high unmet need for services. Despite the array of methodological problems encountered in such studies (Bulut et al., 1995), the evidence is now compelling to suggest high prevalence rates of gynaecological disease in developing countries and associated serious impairment in women’s quality of life. The second phase of studies should seek to build on the initial research to set gynaecological disease in international perspective. Geographical, cultural and also racial characteristics in different parts of the developing world could imply the need for the provision of a range of different and culturally sensitive health services.

Most quantitative assessments of women's health status are still based on maternal health measures. Indicators such as the Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR), the proportion of births attended by a skilled attendant, and the percent of women who attend an antenatal check up are now established in the list of International Development Targets (IDTs). The emphasis on maternity is very appropriate where fertility levels are high, and maternal health services are in great need of improvement, which is the case in most developing countries. Indeed the quality of maternal health and family planning services can have a significant impact on gynaecological health as well as maternal and child outcomes, through the minimisation of iatrogenic transmission of infections (Elias, 1996, Wasserheit and Holmes, 1992).

However, the reliance on the MMR as the main indicator of women's health and status within health systems has problems over and above those of measurement, data collection and definition which are commonly cited (Hulton et al 2000). The focus on mortality ignores the prevalence of many treatable conditions that cause disability and significant distress in women's lives. But also the neglect of non-pregnant women, whether in adolescence, between pregnancies, or after menopause, means that women's health is conceptualised narrowly in terms of maternity and family planning. The former of these problems is tackled to some extent by the development of 'near miss' indicators of severe obstetric morbidity occurring to living women (Stones et al 1991, Hulton et al 2000, Fillippi et al 1998), but these measures still neglect gynaecological illness. Thus the lack of appropriate categorisation of women's health problems, specifically those relating to gynaecological conditions has led to a policy vacuum in this aspect of reproductive health. There is a commensurate deficit in advocacy and training materials as well as curricula for gynaecology. This may be in part because, in contrast to many reproductive health activities, the main focus of gynaecological services is curative rather than preventive.

More recently, with the rise of HIV/AIDS, and the establishment of gynaecological infection (sometimes asymptomatic) as an important risk factor for HIV in women, there is an added impetus for the more careful investigation of gynaecological conditions in women. Moreover, it is clear that the calculation of prevalence rates or the 'burden' of these diseases is only the starting point for an understanding of their importance. Determinants and consequences must also be investigated, with due attention to the construction of conceptual frameworks which seek to elucidate linkages between causes and effects of individual gynaecological outcomes. The burden of health care falls upon health services worldwide, but currently, the burden of stigma and adverse the social burden is borne, for the main part silently by women. The challenge is for service providers to create more socially attuned facilities, for medical educationalists to underline the importance of gynaecology in reproductive health, for policymakers to recognise the significance of gynaecology in international perspective, and

for researchers to find ways to understand and monitor unreported gynaecological ill-health in community and facility studies. To set out the remit of gynaecological health and make the list of relevant conditions can form a foundation from which quantification can emerge. The WHO global programme to quantify the burden of reproductive disease has a possible approach to estimating the extent of this problem.

### **3. Global burden of gynaecological disease**

Given the desirability of moving away from mortality-based indicators as measures of women's health status, the estimation of disease burden via Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) (Murray et al. 1996) offers a promising alternative. The rationale behind this approach, first developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) for their 1993 World Health Report (WHO 1993), emphasises priority setting by selecting health interventions that give the best value for money. It has been suggested that calculating DALYS can help to set priorities within the domain of reproductive health and in relation to other health problems (Vos, 2000).

The DALY is a single, comparable measure of health outcome designed to quantify both premature mortality and disability from groups of diseases at all ages. More specifically it is a discounted and age-weighted composite indicator of the future stream of life lost due to premature deaths added to the future stream of healthy life foregone due to disabilities caused by disease. Having calculated DALYS lost from a disease or group of diseases, cost effectiveness is then measured in terms of cost of interventions 'per DALY saved'. The calculation of life years lost due to mortality from disease is reasonably straightforward to calculate, through the use of cause-specific mortality rates and subsequent comparison with 'ideal' life table rates such as would be found in modern day Japan. The calculation of the magnitude of disabilities is, however, more problematic. DALYs lost through life lived with a disability are calculated by experts who estimate the incidence of disease, the age of onset, and the duration of disability for each specific disease based on community based data, health facility data or expert judgement. Disability weights are also applied. These are based on subjective opinions of disease experts using person trade off methods which determine the proportion of a year of healthy life deemed 'lost' in the presence of disabling disease.

Many criticisms of the DALY approach have been made with respect to the in-built discounting and age weighting assumptions (Williams, 1999, Barendregt et al, 1996, Anand and Hanson, 1997). The use of an idealised life table pattern is also questionable. But these factors are insignificant compared with the debatable nature of the disability weights and the quality of epidemiological estimates of incidence and duration. Particularly in the case of gynaecological disease, the application of disability

weights is not appropriate. Most gynaecological conditions disable women socially, which can be far more crippling, and medical expert opinion will not be able to gauge the extent of such effects.

Measurement of distress, or social or mental stress, would be required as well as the estimation of the extent of disability. It is difficult to see how selective decisions about health care spending could be based on such an indicator. It does not capture women's distress from their own perspective.

Moreover, the DALY calculations that have been carried out in association with reproductive health have excluded key components of gynaecology. There are several definitions of 'reproductive health' that DALY analysts have been able to use (Murray & Lopez 1998), the main four being expressed as follows:

- Consequences of sex in adults...
- Consequences of sex in children and adults...
- Conditions of the reproductive system...
- Conditions managed through reproductive health services...

Important conditions such as fistula, prolapse and menorrhagia are not to be found in any of these lists, which concentrate more on maternal conditions and HIV. It may be a first step towards recognising the importance of gynaecological disease to calculate the DALY burden, but initially there is a need to enumerate all of the possible conditions before data can be brought together. The omission of social distress also implies that measurement tools should also be developed specifically for this element. In addition, there is a need to draw up give a critical overview of the likely mortality, disability and distress of each listed condition worldwide.

In summary, although DALY estimates go some way to recognising morbidity as well as mortality, they have not, to date, included gynaecological disease systematically, and the approach does not provide a sufficient tool by which to capture the nature and extent of gynaecological disease. Nor can the estimations help to understand causes and consequences, nor is it easy to set international goals and targets incorporating DALY estimates.

#### **4. Determination of disease status**

Classification of disease depends on accurate diagnosis, which is subject to the limitations of particular medical settings and is variably feasible in different circumstances. There are essentially three types of diagnostic method:

1. Obtaining a self report of symptoms. The best example would be a painful condition of the reproductive tract in the absence of an identifiable pathological process, such as primary dysmenorrhoea. Assessment of pain depends entirely on self report and attempts to validate self reported pain by some form of test would be fruitless. Self report pain measures are widely used and have good psychometric reliability in different cultures and settings.
2. History, examination and limited investigations through contact with a health worker. Many conditions can be diagnosed with reasonable sensitivity and specificity using learned algorithms relating to clinical presentations. This model forms the basis for the bulk of medical practice in both primary and secondary care settings and its learning is increasingly systematised in medical education using curriculum models based on the finite numbers of ways in which disease can manifest (Woloschuk et al. 2000). Similar models have been applied to mid level service provider training. An example might be the diagnosis of incomplete miscarriage based on the history of pain and vaginal bleeding, confirmed by vaginal examination. The most variable aspect of this model is the extent to which investigations are available: in limited resource settings either no tests might be performed or would be limited to haemoglobin estimation, whereas in highly resourced settings ultrasonography might be advised and the patient's blood group would be determined to assess her need for anti-D immunoglobulin if rhesus negative. In this example the additional information obtained from ultrasonography would be confirmatory rather than essential to the diagnostic process.
3. Definitive laboratory studies or imaging. While some lab studies with high sensitivity and specificity can be undertaken in limited resource primary care settings such as a gram stain of a cervical mucus sample for gonorrhoea, diagnosis of some gynaecological conditions requires laboratory or imaging facilities which are of limited availability in the developing world, but essential for effective provision of services. An example is carcinoma of the cervix: while women may present to health workers with suggestive symptoms such as postcoital bleeding, or be identified in case finding programmes on the basis of inspection of the cervix during an internal examination, histological confirmation of the diagnosis is required, as many suspected cancers will not be confirmed as such. A programme requiring cytological screening of Pap smears for the detection of the pre-malignant phase of the disease is entirely dependent on the availability and quality of laboratory staff, notwithstanding the complex service organisational issues relating to screening in developed as well as developing countries.

Some conditions will be identified at different prevalences depending on the diagnostic criteria used. In the example of chlamydia infection of the female genital tract, some of the population have



asymptomatic carriage of the agent; some present with pain and, in some of these, chlamydia is detectable; some present with pain but no chlamydia is detectable even when laboratory resources of high quality are available. The available technology will influence how frequently chlamydia is detected: prevalence rates of around 2% are quoted in some Indian series (Opportunities and Choices 2000), typical UK rates in women under 25 presenting for termination of pregnancy are 10-12% and ligase chain reaction technology will allow population-based estimates using urine samples to be obtained in the future. The current status of some diagnostic tests relevant to this discussion is presented in Table 1.

The concept of “syndromic” diagnosis has been used to apply the principles of clinical presentation and prior probability to the presumptive diagnosis of reproductive tract infection. This has been shown to be an appropriate and useful approach for some conditions but not others: in a study in Cote d’Ivoire (La Ruche et al. 2000) reports of female genital ulcer were very consistent between 30 clinics offering syndromic diagnosis, but diagnosis of vaginal discharge in the same clinics was highly variable indicating a lack of sensitivity and specificity.

In a setting of low STI prevalence the syndromic approach was found to have a low specificity even when incorporating a vaginal speculum examination and extension of this strategy to the health service would have resulted in large scale over-treatment (Hawkes et al 1999). Rapid and cheap immunodiagnostic tests for reproductive tract infections may become available, as major research effort is currently being invested in this area. However, there are considerable technical problems to be overcome. The current policy implications for service delivery in relation to women were summarised as:

1. Maintain syndromic management approach and treat for vaginitis and genital ulcers
2. Do nothing for women with vaginal discharge
3. Promote trials of rapid cheap tests
4. Screen pregnant women for syphilis

(Askew and Maggwa 2001)

After 10 years of community surveys on gynaecological disease in developing countries, self report techniques have improved. A recent overview (Koenig et al 1998) assessing the results of seven recent surveys has highlighted the key issues in applying self-report strategies to gynaecological problems. Close interaction with the community is important when conducting studies to avoid misunderstandings and omission of important population groups. As well as questionnaires, in depth qualitative studies are required in order to ensure that local terminology for illness and disease is correctly understood. Under-reporting of illness is a consistent problem in developing country settings, especially in the more disadvantaged groups who paradoxically report less morbidity than better off

sections of society. This has been cited as a reason for not utilising self report quality of life data at all in studies of disease burden (Murray, Lopez, Harvard School of Public Health, World Health Organization, & World1996). However, as indicated above to ignore self-report data would be to overlook a considerable burden of illness. In well-designed field studies, probing and consideration of severity can improve validity of self-report measures which would go some way to overcome the problem. A further challenge for investigators is the avoidance of sample loss arising from unwillingness to participate in studies. This applies especially in relation to gynaecologic conditions where open discussion of intimate matters may not be culturally or personally acceptable. It may be necessary to limit the areas and depth of questioning in response to what is acceptable to women in the setting, which again requires careful qualitative study at the design stage. Finally, as indicated above there are very significant variations in clinical definitions in relation to gynaecological disease depending on both the available diagnostic modalities and on expert consensus that will influence the interpretation of data obtained both by self-report and from healthcare facilities.

## **5. Using international classifications of disease as a basis for a revised approach**

Of the recent studies in gynaecological conditions, there is little consensus on which conditions to include. Jejeebhoy and Koenig (forthcoming) categorise conditions into four types as follows:

- Sexually transmitted infections (Chlamydial infection, gonorrhoea, trichomoniasis, syphilis, chancroid, genital herpes, genital warts and HIV)
- Endogenous infections (bacterial vaginosis, candidiasis)
- Iatrogenic infections eg poor delivery or abortion practices
- “Other factors” eg prolapse, menstrual disturbances, fistulae, dyspareunia and urinary tract disorders

While especially useful in conceptualising the distinction between sexually transmitted, endogeneous and iatrogenic infections, this classification has a massive proportion of conditions listed together as “other”. An exhaustive listing based on the International Classification of Diseases (World Health Organization 1992) has the advantage of not omitting significant conditions through grouping. Although this is a predominantly biomedically determined initial approach, we argue that building a consistent list can only begin here – then extensively tested quality of life indicators should be used to understand these conditions in relation to the associated physical and mental distress as suffered by women. We advocate a biomedical list, built on by quantitative as well as qualitative assessment of women’s loss of quality of life. ICD-10 represents a practically useful starting point for this endeavour, and the initial task is to identify the classification items that should be included.

## **ICD-10 categories making up “gynaecological disease”**

Conditions identified in ICD-10 are listed in Table 2. Inflammatory conditions are classified in terms of the affected organs in the first table below (a), and may or may not cross reference to specific infective causes listed in the second table (b). ICD-10 cross refers to specific pathologies with the symbol \*, and a cross reference from pathological states to syndromes are identified with the symbol †. The major advantage of this approach is that it allows for the realities of diagnosis in different settings: data from community surveys or primary health facilities can be classified in terms of clinical presentation without pathological confirmation. Where laboratory data exist these can be tabulated, for example to derive sentinel estimates of disease prevalence. Even with optimal laboratory resources in Western countries a large proportion of clinical presentations do not result in a definitive pathological diagnosis, which reflects the inherent mismatch between illness as experienced by the patient and disease as reflected by a demonstrable pathological process. A classification system based exclusively on pathological diagnosis would seriously underestimate the disease (or illness) burden both in developing country settings where laboratory and imaging facilities are limited but also in Western countries. Conversely, in the course of investigation pathology is sometimes identified as a coincidental feature without any relevance to the patient’s illness. Examples in gynaecologic practice include asymptomatic uterine fibroids and intraperitoneal adhesions. Adhesions are often suspected to be a cause of pain but are actually present equally in women presenting with subfertility in the absence of pain (Rapkin 1986). Uterovaginal prolapse may be identified at the time of gynaecological examination and as a result has been highlighted in a study incorporating vaginal examination (Younis et al 1993). In this instance the resulting prevalence estimate was probably too high as many participants in the study would have been asymptomatic and treatment would not have been appropriate.

It may be important to identify potentially hazardous organisms or pathologies in the population even in the absence of overt illness: for example, in some populations chlamydia is detectable in women in the absence of symptoms, but its potential to cause pelvic inflammatory disease means that a high prevalence in asymptomatic patients would have implications for service delivery, specifically that appropriate antibiotic prophylaxis should be used during invasive procedures such as termination of pregnancy.

ICD-10 and GBD have used the broad primary groupings of “inflammatory disorders” and “non-inflammatory disorders” which has some face validity in distinguishing between the developed and developing world and reflects notions of health transition. However, this distinction is of limited overall utility in the context of gynaecological disease, especially given the important contribution of

early pregnancy complications to disease burden and the inherent problems of relating symptoms to disease. For example, in a patient presenting with lower abdominal pain the detection of chlamydia would lead to classification under “Inflammatory disorders” **A 56**, whereas in the absence of laboratory facilities the patient might be classified on clinical grounds as either **N74** “Female PID” or **R10.2** “Pelvic pain”, the latter category being listed among the “Non-inflammatory conditions”. Both clinical categories are useful and might reflect the degree to which the patient manifested signs of infection or the chronicity of her pain, but neither are specific for chlamydial infection. Thus, the value of the ICD-10 categories lies in their inclusiveness and flexibility but it would not be useful to concatenate gynaecological diseases in terms of the inflammatory/ non inflammatory division.

A grouping of “other important categories” taken from ICD-10 is included below. It could be argued that rape is not a specifically gynaecologic problem: however, women who have experienced sexual assault will be subject to immediate problems of genital tract trauma, potential infection, risk of pregnancy and later potential problems of psychological harm, impact on sexual relationships, and social ostracism. Reproductive health services have a responsibility to address those aspects that can be addressed through service provision, and where sexual assault is a common occurrence the burden in the population needs to be identified because of its special significance for human rights and the collective self-respect of communities and nations as well as for the suffering of individuals.

Faecal incontinence arises from poorly conducted deliveries with inadequate repair of lacerations. Although not life threatening, it is associated with extreme loss of quality of life. Its identification could lead to improved service provision, such as training of midwives and doctors in primary repair of anal sphincter injury sustained during childbirth, as well as tertiary level services for long standing anal sphincter injuries following the service model that has been used for fistula surgery. Urinary incontinence is common during and after childbirth: in a careful prospective questionnaire study of women during and after their first birth the prevalence of urinary incontinence rose from 3.6% before to 43.7% during pregnancy, with 14.6% symptomatic three months postpartum. There was no clear relationship to obstetric variables such as length of labour or mode of delivery (Chaliha et al. 1999). There are important racial differences in susceptibility to urinary stress incontinence (and also uterovaginal prolapse) that need to be considered in estimating disease burden.

The inclusion of “contraceptive management” and gynaecological examination for other purposes reflects the reality that many contacts with reproductive health services are in the context of prevention rather than in response to illness: it will be important to identify women consulting in this mode in order to cross reference illness and disease identified incidentally during such contacts, for example screening for anaemia or STIs. It is very likely that the prevalence of specific conditions will be different in those seeking services compared to those who do not, and in the context of the

reproductive health agenda (as opposed to an exclusive focus on birth control) health workers need to be alert to the fact that many women will find it easier to discuss health problems while accessing contraceptive services. While information on health contacts for screening or contraceptive purposes cannot be considered to contribute to disease burden, their inclusion within records of health service activity is essential. It should be noted that screening interventions are not without morbidity: in particular, the stress and anxiety associated with cervical screening is well documented in Western countries (Wilkinson, Jones, & McBride 1990), and the likely over-diagnosis of sexually transmitted infection using syndromic approaches has the potential for serious adverse consequences in the community (Hawkes et al 1999).

We believe that iron deficiency anaemia (D50) should be included in a listing of gynaecological conditions. Its primary or secondary importance will vary depending on the prevalence of hookworm infestation and nutritional iron deficiency. Among well-nourished women in the reproductive years excessive menstrual loss represents the major primary cause of iron deficiency anaemia; in association with hookworm related blood loss or nutritional iron deficiency co-existing menorrhagia would exacerbate the problem. Anaemia arising from or exacerbated by heavy menstrual loss is potentially influenced by local contraceptive prevalence and method choice, beneficially through use of the combined oral contraceptive pill, or adversely by the use of an IUD.

#### **Available “burden of disease” estimates for gynaecological conditions**

Table 3 indicates those conditions for which some identifiable Burden of Disease data are available. It will be noted that the bulk of the conditions listed earlier are not identifiable within GBD.

## **6. The experience of gynaecological illness and disease: quality of life**

The developers of the Global Burden of Disease methodology specifically rejected incorporation of self report or quality of life questionnaire material (Murray, Lopez, Harvard School of Public Health, World Health Organization, & World1996) on the basis that such material is subjective and correlates poorly with disease as recognised in terms of pathological processes. Furthermore, self reports are highly sensitive to sociocultural factors such that the poor or less educated tend to report less morbidity. The discussion above have highlighted the limitations of the “pathology only” approach to estimating disease burden, such limitations being especially relevant where the mismatch between pathological states and clinical illness is extensive, as is the case with many gynaecological conditions. The failure of syndromic algorithms to capture the appropriate patients or diseases has been reviewed above, and this failure has prompted renewed interest in the potential incorporation of quality of life measures into assessment of gynaecological morbidity (Bhatia & Cleland 2000).

Quality of life instruments have been developed for a number of purposes, which may be summarised as:

1. Enabling comparisons to be made of the impact of different diseases to inform health economic cost utility analyses;
2. Use in clinical trials to assess quality of life outcomes of treatment interventions;
3. Identifying disease impact where functional impairment predominates over pathological features in the natural history of the disease.

A further distinction is between disease specific and generic instruments; a generic instrument would of course be required to achieve the first of the above purposes, whereas the second and third applications would typically require a combination of generic and disease specific tools. A widely used generic instrument geared to health economic applications is EuroQol (EuroQol Group 1990) which evolved as an application of the quality-adjusted life year (Rosser & Kind 1978) based on a two dimensional grid of disability and distress. An advantage of the EuroQol is that a single numeric assessment of health status is derived; clearly this advantage is at the price of detail and meaning. The Short Form-36 (SF-36) (Ware & Snow 1993) is probably the most widely applied generic quality of life instrument, with an extensive literature covering numerous diseases and validated versions for a number of countries and languages, unfortunately none of them in the developing world. The 36 items of the questionnaire load to eight domains relating physical and mental functioning, for which a score on a 0-100 scale is obtained. Normative data in relation to age, gender, social class and disease states are available as are numerous reports of applications to specific conditions. A methodology has been described for distillation of the eight subscales into two summary dimensions, a mental and a physical component score, in both the North American (Ware & Kosinski 1994) and UK (Jenkinson et al. 1996) versions. In respect of gynaecological conditions, examples of the validation and use of SF-36 include menorrhagia (Jenkinson, Peto, & Coulter 1996) and chronic pelvic pain (Stones et al. 2000), (Zondervan et al. 2001). A special consideration for assessing the quality of life impact of gynaecological conditions is the inclusion of items addressing sexual function. These may be problematic in many countries and settings; an example of a relatively non intrusive and acceptable instrument developed in the UK is the Sexual Activity Questionnaire (Thirlaway, Fallowfield, & Cuzick 1996).

The product of a multicountry effort to design a generic quality of life instrument is the WHOQOL (Power et al. 1998) which at the pilot stage incorporated 236 questions plus 41 further items rating the importance of each facet. An important feature of this development process for the present discussion has been the inclusion of investigators in India and Zimbabwe, although the majority of contributions were from developed countries. Further evolution of this instrument is anticipated; the number of items has recently been reduced to 100 (Power, Bullinger, & Harper 1999).

The use of quality of life data remains problematic because of the range of different instruments used in the published studies, and the very limited number of such studies that have been undertaken in developing countries. A combination of approaches will be required, such as the development of new “cross cultural” instruments such as the WHOQOL, but also the validation of existing measures such as SF-36 in as many settings as possible so that existing data relating quality of life to disease states can be utilised. Finally, exploration of “reproductive health related quality of life” as a construct valid for women’s lives and experience, rather than a policy aim, could lead to the formulation of an instrument able to capture this dimension.

## **7. The burden of gynaecological illness and disease: future strategies**

We have indicated the challenges inherent in conceptualising the burden of gynaecological disease and assembling the available data to result in meaningful estimates. The first and vital step has been to identify the relevant conditions using diagnostic criteria sufficiently flexible to accommodate syndromic, clinical and pathological diagnostic methods, and to cross reference data from different sources. Classification systems need to be able to accommodate the link between, for example, menorrhagia and the apparently non-gynaecological result, ie anaemia. Secondly, measurement tools are required so as to derive estimates of incidence, prevalence, mortality and duration. New approaches will be required to incorporate meaningful dimensions of quality of life: at present GBD methodology uses a single weighting value for years lived with disease (YLD) which does not have face validity. In contrast to quality of life measures, the sensitivity of current GBD estimates to interventions is unknown.

Our proposed approach is to use the ICD-10 classification as clinical and administrative basis for tabulation, to use health facilities for data collection according to such tabulations so as to derive incidence and prevalence estimates, and to allow for regional and ethnic variations in gynaecological conditions. Descriptive expert opinions are required for estimates of duration of morbidity, the affected age profile and the sociological aspects of quality of life impact. An appropriate range of conditions can be investigated using community surveys, with due regard for cultural sensitivity, and community based methods would also indicate the health seeking behaviour associated with different conditions. Table 4 indicates examples of the type of overview that could result from the application of this strategy.

## **8. Conclusion**

This paper has presented an approach to the current challenge of adequately conceptualising gynaecological disease to the stage where meaningful data can be assembled from institutional and community survey sources, taking into account the major quality of life impact of many gynaecological conditions even when not life threatening. We believe this approach would go some way to counteracting the omission of a significant group of illnesses and diseases from epidemiological scrutiny and policy formulation. The extent of the disease burden currently borne by women in the developing world is otherwise obscured by an exclusive consideration of mortality data and concatenation of important morbidities to broad groupings. This represents a barrier to the implementation of policy and services directed towards reproductive health.

## **Acknowledgement**

The authors receive funding from the UK Government Department for International Development.

The views expressed in this article are those of the authors.



## **Bibliography**

Anand, S. and Hanson, K (1997) Disability-adjusted life-years: a critical review. *Journal of Health Economics* 11, 179-183.

Askew I. and Maggwa N. 2001. Workshop presentation, *Frontiers in Reproductive Health*, Population Council, Kenya.

Bang, R.A., Bang, A.T., Battule, M., Choudhary, Y. Sarmukaddam, S. and Tale, O. (1989) High prevalence of gynaecological diseases in rural Indian women, *Lancet* i. 85-88.

Bang, R and Bang, A. (1994) Women's perceptions of white vaginal discharge: Ethnographic data from rural Maharashtra, in Gittelsohn, J., Bentley, M., Pelto, P., Nag, M., Pachauri, S., Harrison, A. and Landman, L. (eds), *Listening to women talk about their health issues and evidence from India*, The Ford Foundation, Har-Anand Publications.

Barendregt, J.J., Bonneux, L., and van der Maas, P.J. (1996) DALYs: the age weights on balance. *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation*, 74, 439-443.

Bhatia, J.C., Cleland, J., Bhagavan, L. and Rao, N.S.N.( 1997) Levels and determinants of gynaecological morbidity in a district of south India, *Studies in Family Planning*, 28, 95-103.

Bhatia, J., Cleland, J.(2000) Methodological issues in community-based studies of gynecological morbidity,, *Studies in Family Planning*, 31, 267-273.

Bulut, K., Yolsal, N., Filippi, V. and Graham, W. (1995), In search of truth: Comparing alternative sources of information on reproductive tract infection, *Reproductive Health Matters*, No 6.

Chaliha, C., Kalia, V., Stanton, S. L., Monga, A., Sultan, A. H. (1999) Antenatal prediction of postpartum urinary and fecal incontinence, *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 94, 689-694.

Elias, C. (1996) Introduction and overview. In: *Reproductive tract infection: lessons learnt from the field: where do we go from here?* New York, The Population Council.

EuroQol Group (1990) EuroQol: a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life, *Health Policy*, 16, 199-208.

Fillipi, V., Ronsmans, C., Graham, W. (1998) New Tools for prioritizing and evaluating safe motherhood programmes: the “Near-Misses” and the sisterhood approach. London School of Hygiene Maternal and Child Epidemiology Unit Report.

Hawkes, S., Morison, L., Foster, S., Gausia, K., Chakraborty, J. Weeling, R., Mabey, D.(1999) Reproductive tract infections in women in low-income, low-prevalence situations: assessment of syndromic management in Matlab, Bangladesh, *Lancet*, 354, 1776-1781.

Hulton, L.A., Matthews, Z. , Stones, R.W. (2000), Life threatening but not a death: The measurement of near miss episodes as an alternative indicator of maternal health, Department of Social Statistics Working Paper 2000-06, University of Southampton.

Jenkinson, C., Layte, R., Wright, L., Coulter, A. (1996) The UK SF-36: an analysis and interpretation manual Health Services Research Unit, University of Oxford, Oxford.

Jenkinson, C., Peto, V., Coulter, A. (1996) Making sense of ambiguity:evaluation of internal reliability and face validity of the SF-36 questionnaire in women presenting with menorrhagia, *Quality in Health Care*, 5, 9-12.

Koenig, M., Jejeebhoy, S., Singh, S. and Sridhar, S. (1998), Investigating women’s gynaecological morbidity in India: Not just another KAP survey, *Reproductive Health Matters*, Vol 6 No 11.

La Ruche, G., Ladner, J., Lattier, R., Djeha, D., Louise, D., Coulibaly, I. M. (2000) Surveillance of STD syndromes: contributing to the STD programme in Cote d'Ivoire, *Health Policy and Planning*., 15, 441-446.

Murray, C. J. L., Lopez, A. D. (1998) Health dimensions of sex and reproduction the global burden of sexually transmitted diseases, HIV, maternal conditions, perinatal disorders, and congenital anomalies Harvard School of Public Health, Cambridge, Ma.

Murray, C. J. L., Lopez, A. D. (1996) The global burden of disease: a comprehensive assessment of mortality and disability from diseases, injuries, and risk factors in 1990 and projected to 2020 Published by the Harvard School of Public Health on behalf of the World Health Organization and the World Bank, Cambridge, MA.

Oomman, N. (2000) A decade of research on reproductive tract infections and other gynaecological morbidity in India: What we know and what we don't know, in Ramasubban, R. and Jejeebhoy, S.J. (eds) Women's Reproductive Health in India, Rawat Publications, Delhi.

Opportunities and Choices (2000). Modelling Sexually Transmitted Infections and Women's Reproductive Health. Workshop report available at <http://www.socstats.soton.ac.uk/choices/wshop.pdf>

Power, M., Bullinger, M., Harper, A. (1999) The World Health Organization WHOQOL-100: Tests of the universality of quality of life in 15 different cultural groups worldwide, *Health Psychology*, 18, 495-505.

Power, M., Kuyken, W., Orley, J. et al. (1998) The World Health Organization Quality of Life assessment (WHOQOL): Development and general psychometric properties, *Social Science & Medicine*, 46, 1569-1585.

Ramasubban R. (2000) Women's vulnerability: The recent evidence on sexually transmitted infections, in Ramasubban, R. and Jejeebhoy, S.J. (eds) Women's Reproductive Health in India, Rawat Publications, Delhi.

Ramasubban, R. and Singh, B. (2000) Weakness ("Ashkaptana") and reproductive health among women in a slum population in Mumbai in Obermeyer, C. (ed) Cultural perspectives in reproductive health, OUP.

Rapkin, A. J. (1986) Adhesions and pelvic pain: a retrospective study, *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 68, 13-15.

Rosenfield and Maine (1985) Maternal mortality, a neglected tragedy –where is the M in MCH? *Lancet*, ii, 83-85.

Rosser, R. & Kind, P. (1978) A scale of valuations of states of illness: is there a social consensus?, *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 7, 347-358.

Stones, W, Lim, W, Al-Azzawi and M. Kelly. (1991). An investigation of maternal morbidity with identification of life-threatening 'near miss' episodes. *Health Trends*, 23,13-14.

Stones, R. W., Selfe, S. A., Fransman, S., Horn, S. A. (2000) Psychosocial and economic impact of chronic pelvic pain", *Baillieres Clinics in Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 14, 27-43.

Thirlaway, K., Fallowfield, L., Cuzick, J. (1996) The Sexual Activity Questionnaire: a measure of women's sexual functioning, *Quality of Life Research*, 5, 81-90.

Vos, T. (2000) Ranking reproductive health problems to define service priorities (unpublished paper).

Ware, J. E. & Kosinski, M. K. S. D. (1994) SF-36 Physical & Mental Health Summary Scales A User's Manual. The Health Institute, New England Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts.

Ware, J. E. & Snow, K. K. K. M. G. B. (1993) SF-36 Health Survey: manual and interpretation guide. The Health Institute, New England Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts.

Wasserheit, J.N. Holmes, K.K. (1992) Reproductive tract infections: challenges for international health policy, programs and research, in Germain A et al (eds) *Reproductive tract infections: global impact and priorities for women's reproductive health*, pp 227-249, Plenum Press, New York.

Wilkinson, C., Jones, J. M., McBride, J. (1990) Anxiety caused by abnormal result of cervical smear test: a controlled trial, *British Medical Journal*, 300, 440.

Williams, A. (1999) Calculating the global burden of disease: time for a strategic reappraisal? *Health Economics*, 8, 1-8.

Woloschuk, W., Harasym, P., Mandin, H., Jones, A. (2000) Use of scheme-based problem solving: an evaluation of the implementation and utilization of schemes in a clinical presentation curriculum, *Medical Education*, 34, 437-442.

World Health Organization (1992) *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems*, 10th revision edn, World Health Organization, Geneva.

Younis, N., Khattab, H., Zurayk, H., El-Moelhy, M., Amin, M., and Farag, A. (1993) A community study of gynaecological and related morbidities in rural Egypt, *Studies in Family Planning*, 24, 175-186.

Zondervan, K. T., Yudkin, P. L., Vessey, M. P., et al. The community prevalence of chronic pelvic pain in women and associated illness behaviour. *British Journal of General Practice* (in press).

Zurayk, H., Khattab, H., Younis, N., El-Mouelhy, M. and Fadle, M. (1993) Concepts and measures of reproductive morbidity, *Health Transition Review*, 3, 17-40.

## Tables

Table 1. Status of currently available tests.

Disease	Test status
Anaemia	Simple, cheap tests available
Syphilis	Simple, cheap tests available
Gonorrhoea	Gram stain is simple and cheap, more sensitive and specific tests are expensive
Chlamydia	Current research under way, but at present not cheap. Potential of LCR urine tests for community based studies
Cervical cancer	Cervical screening (by Pap smear) requires skill and lab quality control; potential for more cost effective early case finding interventions rather than cytological screening. Molecular methods for HPV detection likely to be expensive.
Choriocarcinoma	Simple cheap follow up feasible for high prevalence areas with urine HCG (pregnancy) tests.
Early pregnancy complications	Ultrasound- expensive and requires skill but may be available in institutions as heavily used for obstetrics

Table 2: Relevant ICD-10 categories

### Inflammatory disorders

*(a) Inflammatory disorders in terms of clinical presentations or syndromes*

N70	Salpingitis and oophoritis
N74	Female pelvic inflammatory disease *
N76	Vaginitis
N77	Vulval and vaginal ulceration *

*(b) Inflammatory disorders in terms of pathology with specific causative organisms*

A51	Early syphilis [Primary genital syphilis A51.0; Female PID A51.4 † (N74.2*)]
A18.1 †	Tuberculosis of genitourinary system (N74.1*)
B37.3 †	Candidiasis of vulva and vagina (N77.1*)
A55	Chlamydial lymphogranuloma (venereum)
A56 †	Other sexually transmitted chlamydial diseases (N74.4*)
A57	Chancroid
A58	Granuloma inguinale
A59	Trichomoniasis
A60 †	Anogenital herpes viral [herpes simplex] infection (N77.0*)
A54 †	Gonococcal infection (N74.3*)

**Non-inflammatory disorders**

N80	Endometriosis
N81	Female genital prolapse
N82	Fistula (eg vesicovaginal)
N91	Absent, scanty or rare menstruation
N92	Excessive frequent and irregular menstruation
N94	Pain and other cycle related conditions (also R10.2 pelvic and R10.3 lower abdominal pain)
N95	Menopause related conditions
N96	Recurrent miscarriage
N97	Female infertility

Early pregnancy

O00	Ectopic pregnancy
O03	Miscarriage
O04	Induced abortion
O07	Failed attempt to induce abortion (.0 to .9)
O08	Complications following miscarriage, ectopic, molar pregnancy

Tumours

C51	Carcinoma of vulva
C52	Carcinoma of vagina
C53	Carcinoma of cervix
C54-5	Endometrial cancer
C56	Ovarian cancer
C57	Other/ unspecified
C58	Choriocarcinoma
D25	Uterine fibroids

Other important categories

N39	Urinary incontinence (stress N39.3)
R15	Faecal incontinence
T74.2	Rape (“maltreatment syndromes: sexual abuse”)
Z30	Contraceptive management
Z01.4	Gynaecological examination (not for contraceptive purposes, but includes cervical pap smear)
Z12.4	Gynaecological examination for detection of carcinoma cervix
D50	Iron deficiency anaemia

Table 3: Available categories with Burden of Disease estimates for gynaecological conditions.

ICD-10 Disease	Disease burden classification for estimation purposes
N70 Salpingitis and oophoritis	Sequelae of gonorrhoea/ chlamydia only
N74 Female PID	
A54 Gonococcal infection	
A56 Chlamydial STD	
N82 Fistula	Sequela of obstructed labour
N97 Female infertility	Sequelae of gonorrhoea/chlamydia/maternal sepsis/septic Abortion
O00 Ectopic pregnancy	Estimated under abortions and as a sequela of gonorrhoea/chlamydia/maternal sepsis/septic abortion
O04 Abortion	Abortion
O07 Failed attempt to induce abortion (.0 to .9)	
O08 Complications following miscarriage, ectopic, molar pregnancy	
C53 Carcinoma of cervix	Cancers
C54-5 Endometrial cancer	
C56 Ovarian cancer	
C58 Choriocarcinoma	
N39.3 Stress urinary incontinence	Sequela of obstructed labour



Table 4. Prototype categorisation

Condition	Associated mortality risk	Prevalence/ incidence	Diagnostic method	Associated quality of life impact	Comments
Cervical cancer	High	Low	Clinical/ pathological	Disability and distress	Potential for early case finding or screening to reduce burden
Ovarian cancer	High	Low	Clinical/ pathological	Disability and distress	Limited intervention potential
Uterine fibroids	Nil	Marked ethnic variation	Clinical	Moderate impact; associated menstrual disorders	Morbidity of interventions
Uterovaginal prolapse	Nil	Marked ethnic variation	Clinical	Distress	Effectively treatable by surgery
Menorrhagia	Low	High	Syndromic	Disability; distress during menstruation	Contributes to poor general health as excessive menstrual loss leads to iron deficiency anaemia
Infertility	Nil	High; Geographic variation?	Syndromic/ Clinical	Distress	High cost treatment
Ectopic pregnancy	High	1:100 pregnancies	Clinical	Disability	Requires emergency treatment
Genital ulceration	Nil	Geographic variation	Syndromic	Distress	Associated HIV risk