

Quality of Life in Children and Adolescents with Congenital Heart Diseases in Zahedan, Iran

Noor Mohammad Noori¹, *Alireza Teimouri¹, Tahereh Boryri², Shahla Shafiee³

¹Children and Adolescent Health Research Center, Zahedan University of Medical Sciences, Zahedan, Iran. ²Pregnancy Health Research Center, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Zahedan University of Medical Sciences, Zahedan, Iran.

³School of Nursing and Midwifery, Zahedan University of Medical Sciences, Zahedan, Iran.

Abstract

Background

Life expectancy has increased in congenital heart diseases (CHD) patients and the interest has risen considering the quality of life (QOL). The study aimed to compare patients and proxy-parents reports on CHD children' QOL.

Materials and Methods

This cross-sectional study performed on 165 CHD patients aged 2-18 years during 2016 using Pediatric Quality of Life 3.0 (PedsQLTM 3.0) inventory. PedsQLTM 3.0 has same dimensions with different question for various age groups. The internal consistency of the inventory scales and subscales was assessed by means of Cronbach's alpha. Scales with reliability ≥ 0.70 were recommended.

Results

The overall mean score of QOL was significantly higher in parents' perceived (51.78 ± 10.87) compared to children's perceived (48.61 ± 11.25) (t= -2.615, P=0.009). The anxiety was significantly higher $(56.23 \pm 17.93 \text{ vs. } 47.31\pm 17.96)$ in parents' perceived compared to children (t= -2.281, P=0.025). The cognition has been perceived significantly better by children than parents' $(51.22\pm15.76 \text{ vs. } 41.53\pm 13.15)$. Children with simple diseases had higher score of quality of life (53.09 ± 13.44) compared with those children with complex diseases (42.73 ± 18.23) (t=2.786, P=0.007) for 2-4 years age in parents' perceived. The mean scores in heart problem scale were 46.74 ± 13.64 and 61.14 ± 18.17 and for the communication scale were 28.49 ± 13.87 and 41.77 ± 20.23 for pre and post operated children respectively for the age group of 5-7 years in parents' perceived.

Conclusion

Resulted no impacts by two clinical (types of diseases and operation) factors on CHD patients' Health-related quality of life (HRQOL). Therefore should be considered more clinical factors to detect the gap in QOL in CHDs.

Keywords: Children, Congenital heart diseases, Iran, Perceived, Quality of Life.

<u>*Please cite this article as</u>: Noori NM, Teimouri A, Boryri T, Shafiee Sh. Quality of Life in Children and Adolescents with Congenital Heart Diseases in Zahedan, Iran. Int J Pediatr 2017; 5(1): 4293-08. DOI: **10.22038/ijp.2016.8025**

*Corresponding Author:

Alireza Teimouri, M.Phil, PhD in Demography, Children and Adolescent Health Research Center, Zahedan University of Medical Sciences, Zahedan, Iran.

Email: alirezateimouri260@gmail.com

Received date Nov.15, 2016; Accepted date: Dec. 22, 2016

1- INTRODUCTION

Congenital heart diseases (CHDs) are the most frequent fetal malformations, with a prevalence of 8 in 1000 live births (1). Prevalence of CHD was increasing by time from 7.93 to 17.51 in 1000 live births in Iran (2). Also, the mortality rate of CHD patients has been began to fall and continuing to decrease because of advances in diagnostic, surgical and catheter interventional techniques (3). Life expectancy rises due to these causes in these patients so that has drawn out heightened interest in quality of life issues (4). Demographics studies predicted that there will be a noticeable large number of children with CHD that confirms the attention on these patients. Despite of growing population of these survivors and mentioned promotions and advances in medical and healthcare systems, many of these survivors continually faced with worries and challenges on communicational, cognitional, psychosocial, educational, and behavioral aspects that influence their quality of life (5, 6). The concept of quality of life (QOL) is based on the World Health Organization's definition of health that has been expressed as "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or morbidity"(7), and concentrated on the subjective perception of the impact of disease on the various dimension of life. Health-related quality of life (HRQOL) would be considered as an impact or influence of a specific disease or medical therapy on a patient's daily activities and ability to perform in various life contexts (8, 9). Evaluation of HRQOL is important, because it allows for better communication among patients, parents, and health care providers; prioritization of problems in part on the basis of patient and/or parent preferences; monitoring of changes over time or in response to specific therapies; and screening for other significant medical

problems (10). In spite of high advantages, observed lacking of validated surveys and evaluated study of HRQOL in the pediatric population in the area of the study. A more-complete understanding of the impact of CHD on HRQOL in the pediatric population may improve patientcentered medical treatment and outcomes (11). Many of researchers expressed that congenital or acquired cardiovascular diseases exert negative impacts on the HRQOL of patients and their relatives (12-14). The assessment of HROOL in children and adolescents with heart disease has been used as an important health outcome, to identify groups and subgroups that are at risk, track health habits and to better understand the impact of different diagnoses of heart disease on the quality of life of this population. A recent study of children after the Fontan procedure found that medical and patient's conditions as well as family income are the most important factors to predict these patients health status (15).

Previous studies on the psychological adaptation in children with CHD have identified several predictors that may also be important to change the HROOL level. These predictors may are: diagnosis of a cyanotic CHD reduced physical capacity, presence and duration of deep hypothermic circulatory arrest and early parental distress (16). Measuring HRQOL in children with CHD is a relatively new technique and its various dimensions might be assessed using different methods and concepts. The Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory ТМ 3.0 Cardiac Module (PedsQLTM 3.0 Cardiac Module) is a specific instrument that can be easily and quickly applied to measure HROOL in children and adolescents with heart disease. It is validated for use in clinical where facilitates the practice. it identification of risk, health status, and the results of treatment pediatric in populations with heart disease (12, 17).

Accordance with all the matters above introduced to understand the gap in perception due to self and proxy-parents reports of quality of life, we aimed to evaluate the quality of life in children and adolescents with CHD.

2- MATERIALS AND METHODS

A cross-sectional descriptive and analytical study was utilized to measure the quality of life in children with congenital heart diseases who were collected from Ali Asghar hospital belongs to the Zahedan University of Medical Sciences, Zahedan, Iran, for 8 months from February 2016. The measurements were based on self-child and proxyparents' reports.

2-1. Participants' population

Our target population included of two groups; patients with CHD age ranged from 2 to 18 years and about equal number of their parents accompanying their children who were attendant as outpatient

2-2. Exclusion criteria

After consulting with the advanced clinical nurse practitioner and a cardiologist specialized, children with identified chromosomal anomalies and other genetic syndromes and children with major chronic diseases were excluded.

2-3. Ethical issues

The study was approved by the local research ethics committee of the Zahedan University of medical Sciences, Zahedan, Iran accordance with the ethical standards of the Helsinki Declaration and founded by children and adolescent health research An independent center of ZaUMS. researcher obtained informed consent from qualifying patients provided and instructions completing on the questionnaires. The patients and their parents who agreed to participate in the study signed consent form and entered to the study. One hundred and sixty-five patients met inclusion criteria.

After taking participants' consents and providing enough explanation by the project's staffs, the child and proxyreports questionnaires parents' were distributed. Children were assessed by means of a standardized interview containing а HRQOL assessment instruments. All interviews were conducted at the hospital. Parents were assessed at the same time with the questionnaires. The following medical variables were asked from the patients' parents: type of CHD (classified as cyanotic or non-cyanotic according to the commonly used definitions in pediatric cardiology), heart surgeries.

2-4. HRQOL assessment tool

The difficulty of defining and conceptualizing QOL has been became a constant challenge amongst many researchers, especially in constructing a valid and reliable instrument with scales in all concepts and considering the perception is under development on the different individuals.

In general, the QOL assessment tools in childhood have little congruence in relation to the content covered, with different conceptions about normal childhood development in different age groups and the importance of family function and social context as factors that are necessary for their well-being. The broad spectrum of contents and the variety of scales and items investigated in the QOL instruments in childhood, reflect the differences in their process of preparation, theoretical line used, target population and application (18). Solans performed a systematic review on instruments of QOL for children and adolescents and found the existence of 30 generic and 64 specificdisease instruments that published within 5 years from 2001. Samples of generic instruments for pediatric population were: "Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory

(PedsQL)", "Autoquestionnaire de Qualité deVie Enfant Imagé (AUQUEI)", "Child Health Questionnaire (CHQ)" and "Kid screen" (18). The PedsQL 3.0 instrument used for the CHD group in this study was provided and developed by Varni that is using to assess HRQOL and has welldocumented reliability and validity in the pediatric patients and healthy populations(19). To assess quality of life, patients and their parents completed the PedsOL 3.0 with various items in various age groups. The PedsQL 3.0 scales were composed of parallel child self-report and parent proxy-report formats.

The Parents' report for Toddlers (age 2-4) of the PedsQL 3.0 Cardiac Module has been composed of 23 items comprising 6 dimensions (number of items) that are: 1-Heart problems and Treatment (7), 2-Treatment II (3), 3-Perceived Physical Appearance (3), 4- Treatment Anxiety (4), 5-Cognitive Problems (3) and Child an parent 6-Communication (3). reports for young children (ages 5-7) of the PedsQL 3.0 Cardiac Module has been composed of 25 items comprising 6 dimensions (number of items) that are: 1- Heart problems and Treatment (7), 2- Treatment II (3), 3- Perceived Physical Appearance (3), 4- Treatment Anxiety (4), 5-Cognitive Problems (5) and 6-Communication (3).

Also, child an parent reports for children (ages 8-12) and teens (ages 13-18) of the PedsQL 3.0 Cardiac Module has been composed of 27 items comprising 6 dimensions (number of items) that are: 1-Heart problems and Treatment (7), 2-Treatment II (5), 3- Perceived Physical Appearance (3), 4- Treatment Anxiety (4), 5-Cognitive Problems (5) and 6-Communication (3). Five answer options were listed in the versions for children 8 to 18 years old and their parents (0 = it isnever a problem; 1 = it is almost never a problem; 2 = it is sometimes a problem; 3= it is often a problem; and 4 = it is almost always a problem). The answers in the version for children 5 to 7 years old was simplified to three options (0 = not at all; 2 = sometimes; and 4 = a lot) on a visual analog scale that exhibited a happy, neutral, and sad face, respectively. The items were reverse scored and linearly transformed to a 0–100 scale (0 = 100; 1 = 75; 2 = 50; 3 = 25; and 4 = 0) so that higher scores indicated a better HRQOL. The mean score was computed as the sum of all the items over the number of items answered in taking into account the missing data.

The following stages proceed by the authors on the original version of the PedsQL 3.0 Cardiac Module. First, the original English version of the PedsQL 3.0 Cardiac Module was independently translated into Persian by two faculty members in the field of health followed by a joint discussion to combine the two independent versions into a single. Then this issued version backward to original language by two Persian-English bilingual persons .This process conducted according international to the guideline for questioner translation (forward-backward translation).

A pilot study performed on 20 patients with heart disease and their parents at an outpatient setting from, five children in each age range (2-4, 5 -7, 8-12, and 13-18 years old), and their parents were interviewed, for a total of 40 individuals, to assess their responses to the questions identify possible mistakes and and difficulties resulting from the translation. After that, the efforts of the investigators were devoted to achieving linguistic and conceptual equivalence. The cross-cultural adaptation of the questionnaire was performed during this stage to achieve semantic equivalence (equivalence between words), idiomatic equivalence (equivalent expressions or items needing substitution). The internal consistency of the PedsQLTM 3.0 Cardiac Module Scale and Subscales was assessed by means of Cronbach's alpha. Scales with reliability \geq 0.70 are recommended to compare groups of patients. The **Table.1** showed Cronbach's alpha for all dimensions and respondents in specific age group and overall. Application of the questionnaire carried on an average of 10 minutes for both children and parents.

2-5. Statistical study

Statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS 19 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA). First, the clinical variables were subjected to descriptive analysis. The numerical variables were expressed as the means and deviations standard (SD), and the categorical variables were expressed as absolute and relative frequencies. The distribution of all the variables was tested. Differences for parametric variables were established using Student's t-tests. For that purpose 0.05 error regarding 95% confidence interval (CI) were considered.

Age group	Responsive	Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha for each dimension	Total Cronbach's Alpha
		Heart Problems and Treatment	0.763	
		Treatment II	0.752	
2 4 110000	Parents	Perceived Physical Appearance	0.857	0.89
2_4 years	Parents	Treatment Anxiety	0.81	0.89
		Cognitive Problems	0.73	
		Communication	0.825	
		Heart Problems and Treatment	0.758	
		Treatment II	0.837	
	Demot	Perceived Physical Appearance	0.75	0.90
	Parents	Treatment Anxiety	0.752	0.89
		Cognitive Problems	0.721	
<i>с</i> л		Communication	0.754	
5_7 years		Heart Problems and Treatment	0.774	
		Treatment II	0.835	
	Diti	Perceived Physical Appearance	0.779	0.00
	Patients	Treatment Anxiety	0.773	0.89
		Cognitive Problems	0.783	
		Communication	0.910	
		Heart Problems and Treatment	0.903	
		Treatment II	0.916	
	Demot	Perceived Physical Appearance	0.808	0.97
	Parents	Treatment Anxiety	0.964	0.87
8_12 years		Cognitive Problems	0.786	
Jours		Communication	0.832	
		Heart Problems and Treatment	0.905	
	Patients	Treatment II	0.821	0.84
		Perceived Physical Appearance	0.779	

Table-1: Cronbach's alpha for all dimensions and respondents in specific age groups

		Treatment Anxiety	0.947	
		Cognitive Problems	0.881	
		Communication	0.945	
		Heart Problems and Treatment	0.951	
		Treatment II	0.823	
	Parents	Perceived Physical Appearance	0.835	0.92
	ratents	Treatment Anxiety	0.774	0.92
		Cognitive Problems	0.779	
13_18	-	Communication	0.773	
years		Heart Problems and Treatment	0.951	
		Treatment II	0.778	
	Detients	Perceived Physical Appearance	0.835	0.93
	Patients	Treatment Anxiety	0.777	0.93
		Cognitive Problems	0.799	
		Communication	0.773	

3- RESULTS

Descriptive results of patients are observed in Table.2 and Table.3. Sex distribution of patients was not equally, with more boys taking part in the study. The sample of participants consisted of 94(57%) boys and 71(43%) girls that they distributed in four age groups of 2-4 years, 5-7 years, 8-12 years and 13-18 years with 46%, 30%, 16% and 8%, respectively. Hundred five (65%) participants had simple diseases and of them 59(55.1%) had undergone surgery when this measure were 87(52.7%) for overall patients. Table.4 showed means and standard deviation (SD) of the PedsQL scores and its dimensions for different age groups regarding self- child and the proxyparent's reports. The overall mean score of PedsQL was significantly higher in parents' perceived (51.78 ± 10.87) children's compared to perceived (48.61 ± 11.25) (t= -2.615, P=0.009). Same pattern occurred for age groups of 5-7 and 13-18 years. Children in the age group of 8-12 years perceived higher score of PedsQL compared to parents, but not significantly. The dimensions of PedsOL; treatment, physical activities and communication showed that they have

similar scores in both children and parents' perceived for all age groups. Dimension of heart problem showed a significant difference in favor of parents for the overall age groups compared with children perceived (P<0.001). The results showed that for this specific dimension did not observe any dissimilarity for each specific age group in the study. The anxiety was significantly higher dimension (56.23 ±17.93 vs. 47.31± 17.96) in parents' perceived compared to children (t = -2.281, P=0.025). Children and parents had different perceived in regard of cognition scale. This dimension has been perceived significantly better by children than parents' $(51.22\pm15.76 \text{ vs. } 41.53\pm$ 13.15).

Table.5 showed comparison of health related quality of life and its dimensions between children with simple and complex heart diseases in various age groups for children and parents' perceived separately. For the first age group 2-4 years, the parents filled out the inventory and the results showed that the first dimension affected by type of diseases such that in parents' perceived, the heart problem dimension, children with simple diseases (53.09 ± 13.44) had higher score of quality

of life compared with those children with complex diseases (42.73±18.23) (t=2.786, P=0.007). The results for the age group of 5-7 did not show any significant differences between the type of diseases for all dimensions and HRQOL in both children and parents' perceived. Same trend could be observed for the age group of 13-18. Communication as a dimension for the quality of life, showed a significant difference in mean between the two types of diseases in the case of children perceived. Table.6 showed comparison of health related quality of life and its dimensions between pre and post operated children in various age groups regarding children and parents' perceived. For the age group of 2-4 the children could not fill out the inventory. Therefore for this specific age group we consider the results for the parents' perceived. The t- test analysis revealed any differences between pre and post operated children in the parents' perceived in the mean of scores for HROOL and its dimensions. Similar pattern could be observed for the age groups of 8-12 and 13-18 for both children and parents' perceived. But the age group of 5-7 showed the valuable results for the dimensions of heart problem and communication. The results could be seen in the table that tells us a significant differences between per and post operated children so that for the heart problem the mean scores were 46.74±13.64 and 61.14+18.17 and for the communication dimension means score were 28.49 ± 13.87 and 41.77±20.23 for pre and post operated children respectively. Similar to type of disease that not influenced the patients HRQOL in self and proxy- parents' reports, surgical operation had same effect. If any different observed due to these factors, the differences was in low age groups because of not adaptation in early years of their life.

Table-2: Sex distribution frequency of participants in different age groups

Candan	Statistics		Age grou	ips (year)		Total
Gender	Statistics	2-4	5-7	8-12	13-18	Totai
Female	Number	33	21	10	7	71
remaie	%	44.0%	42.0%	37.0%	53.8%	43.0%
Male	Number	42	29	17	6	94
Iviale	%	56.0%	58.0%	63.0%	46.2%	57.0%
Tatal	Number	75	50	27	13	165
Total	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table-3: Type of diseases	s frequency distribution	in pre and post of	operated children
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Type of diagona	Statistics	Oper	ation	Total
Type of disease	Statistics	Pre	Post	Total
Simple	n	48	59	107
Simple	%	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%
Complay	n	30	28	58
Complex	%	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
Total	n	78	87	165
Total	%	47.3%	52.7%	100.0%

Table-4: Comparison of health related quality of life and its dimensions between children and parents' perceived for different age groups

Dimensions	Age groups (year)	Participant	Mean	SD	t-test	P-value
	2.4	Children				
	2_4	Parents	49.27	16.09		
		Children	52.54	14.56	1.056	0.004
em	5_7	Parents	56.29	17.52	-1.056	0.294
robl	0.10	Children	53.01	18.01	0.44.6	0.670
Heart Problem	8_12	Parents	50.96	21.12	0.416	0.679
Hea	10.10	Children	55.82	19.08		
	13_18	Parents	66.16	14.29	-1.636	0.121
-	T (1	Children	46.13	18.57	2.404	0.001
	Total	Parents	53.01	17.85	3.404	< 0.001
	2.4	Children				
	2_4 y	Parents	67.28	17.63	-	
-		Children	61.69	19.79	1.715	0.000
	5_7 y	Parents	68.45	16.67	-1.715	0.090
Treatment		Children	61.81	12.79		
eatr	8_12 y	Parents	57.88	13.19	1.152	0.254
T T		Children	80.00	16.04		
	13_18 y	Parents	79.23	9.09	0.153	0.880
F		Children	63.51	20.23		
	13_18 y Total 2_4	Parents	67.14	16.84	-1.760	0.079
		Children				
	2_4	Parents	54.59	12.64	-	
~		Children	52.39	13.38		
Physical activities	5_7	Parents	52.00	13.19	0.135	0.893
ctiv		Children	49.51	12.59		
cal a	8_12	Parents	49.69	14.61	-0.052	0.960
ıysid	10.10	Children	57.61	14.26		
Ph	13_18	Parents	61.31	15.35	-0.661	0.515
	T 1	Children	51.53	12.08	1.100	0.4.5.4
	Total	Parents	53.55	13.55	-1.430	0.154
	2.4	Children				
	2_4	Parents	46.98	19.74		
		Children	47.31	17.96		0.005
	5_7	Parents	56.23	17.93	-2.281	0.025
iety	0.12	Children	62.44	15.68	1.017	0.000
Anxiety	8_12	Parents	57.54	16.03	1.217	0.228
4	10.10	Children	69.58	19.89	0.750	0.177
	13_18	Parents	75.05	18.00	-0.758	0.455
ŀ		Children	48.73	22.02		0.000
	Total	Parents	53.67	19.95	-2.136	0.033

Upper 2_4 Parents 38.82 12.98 5_7 Children 35.22 14.71 -0.476 0.647 8_12 Parents 36.96 19.19 -0.476 0.647 8_12 Parents 45.14 17.89 0.924 0.359 13_18 Children 60.00 21.18 -0.190 0.851 Total Parents 61.54 21.66 -0.933 0.352 7 Children 39.18 19.32 -0.933 0.352 7 Children 29.88 7.89 -0.933 0.352 5_7 Children 29.88 7.89 0.378 0.706 8_12 Children 51.22 15.76 2.588 0.012 13_18 Children 58.33 16.61 -0.198 0.845 13_18 Parents 59.71 20.27 -0.198 0.845 13_18 Parents 50.96 10.32 -0.198 0.845			Children				
OUTING 5_7 Children 35.22 14.71 -0.476 0.647 8_12 Parents 36.96 19.19 -0.476 0.647 8_12 Parents 45.14 17.89 0.924 0.359 13_18 Children 60.00 21.18 -0.190 0.851 Total Parents 61.54 21.66 -0.933 0.352 Total Children 39.18 19.32 -0.933 0.352 5_7 Children 29.88 7.89 0.378 0.706 8_12 Children 51.22 15.76 2.588 0.012 8_12 Children 51.22 15.76 2.588 0.012 13_18 Children 58.33 16.61 -0.198 0.845 13_18 Parents 59.71 20.27 -0.198 0.845 13_18 Parents 50.96 10.32 -0.198 0.845 5_7 Children 42.36 17.25		2_4	Children		10.00	-	
OUTION 5_7 Parents 36.96 19.19 -0.476 0.647 8_12 Children 49.47 18.79 0.924 0.359 13_18 Children 60.00 21.18 -0.190 0.851 Total Parents 61.54 21.66 -0.933 0.352 Total Parents 41.09 17.70 -0.933 0.352 5_7 Children 29.88 7.89 0.378 0.706 8_12 Children 51.22 15.76 2.588 0.012 13_18 Children 51.22 15.76 2.588 0.012 8_12 Parents 41.53 13.15 2.588 0.012 13_18 Children 58.33 16.61 -0.198 0.845 Total Parents 42.61 16.19 -0.198 0.845 13_18 Parents 50.96 10.32 - - 5_7 Children 42.36 17.25 0.							
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	с	5 7				-0.476	0.647
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	atio						
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	inic	8 12				0.924	0 359
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	nmu	0_12	Parents	45.14	17.89	0.921	0.557
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Con	13 18	Children	60.00		-0 190	0.851
Total Parents 41.09 17.70 -0.933 0.352 2_4 Children Parents 48.17 16.79 0.000 <	-	15_10	Parents	61.54	21.66	0.170	0.001
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c } \hline \mbox{Parents} & 41.09 & 17.70 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$		Total	Children	39.18	19.32	0.033	0.352
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Total	Parents	41.09	17.70	-0.935	0.332
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c } \hline \mbox{Parents} & 48.17 & 16.79 & & & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 29.21 & 8.25 & 0.378 & 0.706 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 29.21 & 8.25 & 0.378 & 0.706 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 29.21 & 8.25 & 0.378 & 0.706 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 29.21 & 8.25 & 0.378 & 0.706 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 41.53 & 13.15 & 2.588 & 0.012 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 41.53 & 13.15 & 0.198 & 0.845 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 59.71 & 20.27 & -0.198 & 0.845 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 59.71 & 20.27 & -0.198 & 0.845 & \\ \hline \mbox{Total} & \mbox{Parents} & 42.36 & 17.25 & 0.131 & 0.896 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 42.36 & 17.25 & 0.131 & 0.896 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 50.96 & 10.32 & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 50.96 & 10.32 & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 49.86 & 9.36 & -1.679 & 0.097 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 50.52 & 8.98 & 1.734 & 0.088 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 50.52 & 8.98 & 1.734 & 0.088 & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & 63.56 & 10.91 & -0.846 & 0.405 & \\ \hline \mbox{Total} & \ \mbox{Parents} & 67.17 & 11.66 & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Total} & \ \mbox{Parents} & 67.17 & 11.66 & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Total} & \ \mbox{Parents} & 67.17 & 11.66 & & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Total} & \ \mbox{Parents} & 67.17 & 11.66 & & & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Total} & \ \mbox{Parents} & 67.17 & 11.66 & & & & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Total} & \ \mbox{Children} & \ \mbox{48.61} & 11.25 & -2.615 & 0.009 & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & \ \mbox{Children} & \ \mbox{48.61} & 11.25 & -2.615 & 0.009 & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & \ \mbox{Parents} & \ \mbox{67.17} & 11.66 & & & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & \ \mbox{67.17} & 11.26 & & & & & & & & \\ \hline \mbox{Parents} & \ \mbox{67.17} & 11.26 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$		2.4	Children				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		2_4	Parents	48.17	16.79		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		5 7	Children	29.88	7.89	0.270	0.706
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	E	5_7	Parents	29.21	8.25	0.578	0.706
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	itio	9.12	Children	51.22	15.76	2 5 9 9	0.012
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	logn	8_12	Parents	41.53	13.15	2.388	0.012
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	0	12 10	Children	58.33	16.61	0.109	0.945
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		13_18	Parents	59.71	20.27	-0.198	0.845
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		T - (- 1	Children	42.61	16.19	0.121	0.000
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Total	Parents	42.36	17.25	0.131	0.890
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		2.4	Children				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		2_4	Parents	50.96	10.32		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		5.7	Children	46.51	8.90	1 (70)	0.007
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		5_/	Parents	49.86	9.36	-1.679	0.097
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	TO	0.12	Children	54.27	7.59	1.504	0.000
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	IRQ	00 8_12 -	Parents	50.52	8.98	1.734	0.088
13_18 Parents 67.17 11.66 -0.846 0.405 Total Children 48.61 11.25 -2.615 0.009	j.L.j		Children	63.56	10.91	0.047	
Total Children 48.61 11.25 -2.615 0.009			Parents			-0.846	0.405
Total $-2.615 0.009$			Children	48.61			
			Parents	51.87	10.87	-2.615	0.009

SD: Standard deviation; HRQOL: Health-related quality of life.

Table-5: Comparison of health related quality of life and its dimensions between children with simple and complex heart diseases in various age groups for children and parents' perceived

				Partic	ipants						
		Parent	ts			-			Childre	n	
Dimensions Of QOL	Types Of diseases	Ν	Mean	SD	t-test	P- value	N	Mean	SD	t-test	P- value
2_4 years age gi	roups										
Heart Problem	Simple	45	53.09	13.44	2.786	0.007					
Healt Floblelli	Complex	28	42.73	18.23	2.780	0.007					
Treatment	Simple	45	69.51	14.83	1.285	0.203					
Treatment	Complex	30	64.17	21.23	1.285	0.205					
Physical	Simple	45	56.08	12.13	1.507	0.136					
Appearance	Complex	30	51.68	12.79	1.307	0.130					
Anxiety	Simple	45	49.11	18.49	1.163	0.248					

	~ .					1					
	Complex	30	43.68	21.68							
Communication	Simple	45	40.20	13.26	1.483	0.142					
	Complex	30	35.82	11.39							
Cognitive	Simple	45	49.67	16.33	0.963	0.339					
problems	Complex	30	45.83	17.74	0.700	0.007					
HRQOL peds	Simple	45	52.94	10.10	2.590	0.012					
3.0	Complex	30	46.84	9.86	2.570	0.012					
5_7 years age gr			T			1		Г	Г	Г	
Heart Problem	Simple	30	52.36	19.48	-1.627	0.110	22	54.86	17.08	1.180	0.246
	Complex	20	60.63	14.29			15	49.14	9.30		
Treatment	Simple	30	67.52	10.70	-0.446	0.658	22	60.21	21.43	-	0.588
	Complex	20	69.66	22.92	01110	0.000	15	63.87	17.60	0.546	0.000
Physical	Simple	30	53.50	13.50	1.141	0.259	22	52.23	16.44	-	0.928
Appearance	Complex	20	49.19	12.50	1.171	0.237	15	52.64	7.39	0.091	0.720
Anxiety	Simple	30	55.85	18.45	-0.001	0.999	22	46.11	18.59	-	0.628
THIXIETY	Complex	20	55.86	17.62	0.001	0.777	15	49.08	17.47	0.489	0.020
Communication	Simple	30	37.11	18.07	0.175	0.862	22	35.78	17.63	0.276	0.785
Communication	Complex	20	36.14	20.95	0.175	0.802	15	34.40	9.41	0.270	0.785
Cognitive	Simple	30	28.49	7.12	-0.564	0.575	22	29.59	8.06	-	0.787
problems	Complex	20	29.84	9.88	-0.304	0.373	15	30.31	7.88	0.272	0.787
HRQOL peds	Simple	30	49.14	8.56	-0.391	0.697	22	46.46	8.52	-	0.971
3.0	Complex	20	50.22	10.93	-0.391	0.097	15	46.57	9.73	0.037	0.971
8_12 years age g	groups										
Heart Problem	Simple	17	50.05	19.19	-0.729	0.473	29	54.50	15.90	1.669	0.104
Heart Problem	Complex	10	56.07	23.21	-0.729	0.475	6	41.56	23.56	1.009	0.104
	Simple	16	59.81	8.71	1 000	a a aa	27	62.22	13.32	0 (14	0 5 4 4
Treatment	Complex	9	53.89	18.67	1.088	0.288	6	58.61	11.47	0.614	0.544
Physical	Simple	17	51.96	12.59	0.126	0.667	29	48.92	11.67	-	0.017
Appearance	Complex	10	49.26	19.68	0.436	0.667	6	49.51	16.94	0.105	0.917
	Simple	17	59.72	15.52	0.7.10	0.465	29	62.57	16.16	-	0.627
Anxiety	Complex	10	55.07	16.12	0.742	0.465	6	65.97	10.89	0.490	0.627
a	Simple	17	49.57	20.25	1 0 0 0		29	45.98	18.04	-	0.010
Communication	Complex	10	41.78	12.35	1.099	0.282	6	66.67	14.91	2.621	0.013
Cognitive	Simple	17	44.41	12.06	0.020	0.041	29	51.38	14.19	-	
problems	Complex	10	39.75	13.45	0.930	0.361	6	55.63	19.82	0.624	0.537
HRQOL peds	Simple	16	52.41	7.72			27	53.85	8.32	-	
3.0	Complex	9	49.96	10.36	0.673	0.508	6	56.32	3.82	0.706	0.486
13_18 years age	-		•			1	I	L	L	L	I
	Simple	9	69.57	11.13			12	55.65	17.23		[
Heart Problem	Complex	4	58.50	19.33	1.329	0.211	3	56.48	30.23	0.065	0.949
	Simple	9	79.44	9.82			12	79.17	16.63		
Treatment	Complex	4	78.75	8.54	0.122	0.905	3	83.33	16.07	- 0.390	0.703
Dham's 1	Simple	4 9	63.73	8.34 17.66			12	85.55 55.06	9.03	0.070	
Physical Appearance	-	9 4	55.88	7.37	0.840	0.419	3	67.81	9.03 27.93	- 1.436	0.175
representation	Complex	4 9					3 12			1. 1.50	
Anxiety	Simple		74.38	16.61	-0.193	0.850		67.19	20.14	- 0.929	0.370
	Complex	4	76.56	23.59			3	79.17	19.09	0.929	

C	Simple	9	60.19	18.06	0.225	0.751	12	59.03	20.24	-	0.726
Communication	Complex	4	64.58	31.46	-0.325	0.751	3	63.89	29.27	0.344	0.736
Cognitive	Simple	9	60.00	19.47	0.074	0.943	12	57.08	13.16	-	0.579
problems	Complex	4	59.06	25.15	0.074	0.943	3	63.33	30.55	0.569	0.379
HRQOL peds	Simple	9	67.88	12.22	0.220	0.755	12	62.20	7.31	-	0.252
HRQOL peds 3.0	Complex	4	65.56	11.85	0.320	0.755	3	69.00	22.00	0.964	0.353

Table-6: Comparison of health related quality of life and its dimensions between pre and post operated children in various age groups for children and parents' perceived

				Partic	cipants						
		Parer	nts						Childre	en	
Dimensions Of QOL	Operation	N	Mean	SD	t-test	P- value	N	Mean	SD	t-test	P- value
2_4 years age gr	roups										
Heart Problem	pre	33	48.05	14.43	-	0.613					
Ticart T Toblem	post	40	49.99	17.57	0.508	0.015					
Treatment	pre	35	67.21	18.03	-	0.941					
Treatment	post	40	67.52	17.70	0.074	0.941					
Physical	pre	35	53.77	9.10	-	0.723					
Appearance	post	40	54.80	14.96	0.355	0.725					
Anxiety	pre	35	45.36	19.73	-	0.522					
AllXICty	post	40	48.33	20.13	0.643	0.522					
Communication	pre	35	39.43	13.28	0.624	0.534					
Communication	post	40	37.59	12.18	0.024	0.554					
Cognitive	pre	35	45.55	14.86	-	0.217					
problems	post	40	50.40	18.39	1.245	0.217					
HRQOL peds	pre	35	49.43	9.96	-	0.408					
3.0	post	40	51.44	10.78	0.833	0.408					
5_7 years age gi	roups										
Heart Droblers	pre	19	46.74	13.64	-	0.005	25	54.60	14.71	1 252	0.210
Heart Problem	post	31	61.14	18.17	2.973	0.005	12	48.25	13.84	1.252	0.219
Tractment	pre	19	63.67	17.75	-	0.116	25	60.85	21.24	-	0.712
Treatment	post	31	71.26	15.28	1.602	0.116	12	63.46	17.09	0.371	0.713
Physical	pre	19	51.35	9.63	-	0.859	25	53.98	12.56	1.044	0.303
Appearance	post	31	52.04	15.06	0.179	0.839	12	49.08	14.97	1.044	0.505
Anxiety	pre	19	57.81	15.99	0.600	0.552	25	45.15	17.77	-	0.298
Allxlety	post	31	54.65	19.19	0.000	0.552	12	51.81	18.28	1.057	0.298
Communication	pre	19	28.49	13.87	-	0.015	25	34.67	13.37	-	0.748
Communication	post	31	41.77	20.23	2.516	0.015	12	36.37	17.76	0.324	0.748
Cognitive	pre	19	29.49	6.90	0.307	0.760	25	30.76	9.36	0.982	0.333
problems	post	31	28.75	9.10	0.307	0.700	12	28.04	2.60	0.982	0.333
HRQOL peds	pre	19	46.26	8.44	-	0.052	25	46.67	8.47	0.150	0.975
3.0	post	31	51.60	9.64	1.991	0.052	12	46.17	10.12	0.159	0.875
8_12 years age §	groups										
Heart Problem	pre	7	40.52	20.65	-	0.078	15	55.11	15.16	0.814	0.421

	post	20	56.40	19.33	1.840		20	50.16	19.54		
Treatment	pre	6	62.50	4.18	1.034	0.312	14	61.07	15.48	-	0.854
Treatment	post	19	56.16	14.64	1.054	0.512	19	61.93	11.09	0.186	0.834
Physical	pre	7	56.02	5.04	1.019	0.318	15	49.51	10.12	0.199	0.843
Appearance	post	20	49.19	17.28	1.019	0.518	20	48.65	14.16	0.199	0.845
Anxiety	pre	7	48.31	17.67	-	0.054	15	62.36	17.44	-	0.795
Allxlety	post	20	61.39	13.71	2.018	0.054	20	63.75	13.92	0.262	0.795
Communication	pre	7	48.81	15.54	0.359	0.723	15	45.00	16.31	-	0.229
Communication	post	20	45.94	18.95	0.559	0.725	20	52.92	20.64	1.225	0.229
Cognitive	pre	7	42.50	10.68	-	0.965	15	50.25	10.81	-	0.535
problems	post	20	42.75	13.39	0.045	0.965	20	53.50	17.72	0.627	0.555
HRQOL peds	pre	6	48.76	8.00	-	0.378	14	53.19	8.16	-	0.487
3.0	post	19	52.40	8.84	0.899	0.578	19	55.12	7.48	0.703	0.487
13_18 years age	groups										
II (Decklass	pre	2	53.93	15.05	-	0.200	7	65.37	21.52	2 000	0.067
Heart Problem	post	11	68.38	13.68	1.362	0.200	8	47.45	12.63	2.000	0.067
Treatment	pre	2	82.50	10.61	0.536	0.603	7	82.86	16.55	0.631	0.520
Treatment	post	11	78.64	9.24	0.550	0.005	8	77.50	16.26	0.051	0.539
Physical	pre	2	53.43	0.00	-	0.454	7	63.37	19.98	1.532	0.149
Appearance	post	11	62.74	16.37	0.776	0.434	8	52.57	1.59	1.332	0.149
Anxiety	pre	2	87.50	8.84	1.069	0.308	7	67.86	21.17	-	0.766
Allxlety	post	11	72.79	18.56	1.009	0.508	8	71.09	20.03	0.304	0.700
Communication	pre	2	70.83	5.89	0.643	0.533	7	59.52	20.09	-	0.939
Communication	post	11	59.85	23.22	0.043	0.555	8	60.42	23.46	0.079	0.939
Cognitive	pre	2	45.63	7.95	-	0.305	7	58.75	15.63	0.088	0.932
problems	post	11	62.27	20.97	1.075	0.505	8	57.97	18.50	0.000	0.932
HRQOL	pre	2	65.64	3.44	-	0.850	7	66.29	13.54	0.901	0.384
IKQUL	post	11	67.45	12.70	0.194	0.030	8	61.17	8.18	0.901	0.364

4- DISCUSSION

The results of the present study showed that the overall mean score of PedsQL was significantly higher in the proxy-parents report compared to self-report such that in the cognation dimension, this difference was in the favor of self-report in age group of 8-12 years, in anxiety, the difference was in favor of parents' perceived in the age group of 5-7 years. For the age group of 2-4 years, children with simple diseases had higher quality of life in the heart problems. Communication score was lower for children with sample diseases in self-perceived. In comparison of quality of life scores between pre and post-surgical operation in CHD patients, heart problems

and communication had lower scores in pre operation in proxy-parent reports for the age group of 5-7 years. Karsdorp demonstrated that young people had lower quality of life compared to their elder counterparts in the behavior problems (20). Along with Karsdorp study, Ternestedt showed a large impact on elder patients' quality of life (16). Our results confirmed by these studies' findings (16, 20). Teixeira concluded a non-significant difference of QOL between age groups (21) in which was dissimilar with our results. Landolt revealed that the child's age was correlated with self-reported of quality of life positively and was correlated with proxyparent report negatively in overall or some

of QOL dimensions (22). The results of the present study showed that the quality of life in overall and in some of the dimensions was higher in the elder age groups of adolescents or children in which was similar with Ternestedt (16) and dissimilar with Teixeira (21). Different methodologies have limited our study to be compared with other studies results directly. Some important studies have been involved in chronic disease groups in children with end-stage renal disease, epilepsy and cystic fibrosis (23), so that has been reported that children with diabetes experience had less reduction in QOL compared to other chronic diseases.

Brosig confirmed higher quality of life reported by parents of children with CHD than parents of children with other chronic diseases (24). In our study we received to the conclusion that overall QOL and the dimension of heart problem had different scores between proxy-parent and selfreports in favor of parents. It means that had better perception parents and understanding about the problems of heart. In the case anxiety scale different perception was observed for age group of 5-7 years in favor of parents. In the cognition scale, the significant variation observed in favor of children aged 8-12 years. And finally foe the total HRQOL score, this significant higher of the score was in favor of parents. In conclusion would be reported that parents had better perceived of their children about the quality of life. Spijkerboer found that children with CHD had more negative views compared their parents in overall quality of life and some of its dimensions (25). Lawoko reported some parental problems with children who suffered from CHD in different areas of the QOL in compared with own children perceived (26). Similarly, Buechel (27) and Landolt (22) revealed that proxy-parents reports showed a poorer HRQOL in their children than the child's reports. Eiser conducted a study in assessing quality of life in cancer survivors to compare the self- children and proxy-mothers perception. Despite the lengthy treatment, survivors of all form cancers did not consider their lives to be significantly at risk compared with a healthy population. Eiser had also Quoted a poorer quality of life in total and the dimensions from parents side compared to survivors from Grootendorst and Ennett's studies (28). Arafa resulted that parents had better perception on HRQOL than own children (29). The most HROOL dimensions were impaired in self- report. These dimensions were autonomy, motor, social, and emotional functioning. But in proxy- parents reports the dimension of cognitive functioning were low (22). Several studies showed that children with CHD have different level in quality of life and some of its dimensions regarding the severity of illness. In our study not observed significant differences between quality of life and the dimensions scores based on the severity of diseases (complex and simple) except the communication dimension that was in favor of patients with complex diseases. Uzark (12)reported that the proxy- parents perceived on overall quality of life level was not significantly different in young CHD children with severity diseases, but children with more severe cardiovascular disease had worse physical and psychosocial quality of life that was comparable with our results. Similarly, Ternestedt compared several patient subgroups and showed that not only the severity of illness, but also the presence of cyanosis had not an impact on HRQOL (16). Knowles showed that children with serious CHDs experience lower QOL than unaffected (30) similar with Uzark (12), Ternested (16) in confirming our results, but Knowles (30) result was dissimilar. Uzark reported that parents perceived of quality of life was not significantly different young children with in cardiovascular disease, but children with more severe cardiovascular disease have worse physical and psychosocial quality of life. One in 5 children with cardiovascular disease perceives impaired psychosocial functioning, including children with mild disease severity. Arafa Revealed that severity of illness and type of heart defect were associated significantly with poorer HRQOL (29). Contrary to the results by Krol (31) that showed HRQOL in children with congenital heart disease was not influenced by severity of disease. Similar to Krol (31), DeMaso (32) found nonrelationship between significant the severity of congenital heart defect and quality of life. Teixeira reported that no significant differences in OOL scores were related to the severity of the illness and patients with better social support had better QOL in general and across all dimensions. Females had greater social support than the male participants and consequently better quality of life. In some of dimension, Teixeira also reported that patients who were satisfied with their physical abilities had better QOL in psychological overall. physical and dimensions (21). The effect of surgery on HROOL scores has been studied by many researchers. In these terms we concluded that surgery in overall had not significant impact on the CHD patients' QOL and the dimensions for all age groups based on the both proxy-parents and self-reports. But in two specific scales we observed significant impacts. First, heart problem scores showed a higher value for post-operation due to proxy-parent perceived for 5-7 years age group; and communication was the second exception that followed same trends. Ternestedt reported similar findings with our results (16). Some studies identified that QOL after cardiac surgery was measured worse for children with cardiac defects using child self-report in comparison with 'healthy' group reports (33-35), when we found better QOL.

Children with more 'severe' CHDs rated OOL lower, although 'severe' was variously defined as cyanosis (33). Or type of intervention (12). Recent studies showed that children with CHD undergone cardiopulmonary bypass surgery may be faced with decreasing in the quality of life at follow-up (15, 22, 25, 36). To compare our results with mentioned researches' results in majority would be found same results in limited studies in contrary. The main implications that can be drawn from our findings are that children with CHD are particularly affected in terms of physical functioning in infancy and cognitive functioning in higher age.

4-1. Study limitation

The PedsQL as a generic measure of HRQOL may lack sensitivity for specific problems of children with CHD. However, the PedsQL has successfully been used in children with a variety of different CHD diseases and has been shown that it would be a valid and reliable measure allowing comparison between different groups of CHD patients accordance.

5- CONCLUSION

It should be noted that the PedsQL is a subjective measurement toll for QOL for chronic diseases accordance with self and parents-proxy reports; therefore, different caregivers and different tools to measure the quality of life may rate the child's quality of life differently with many reported, but overall from the present study concluded that the gap between self and proxy-parents reports diminished by age. The results of the present study showed any impacts by two clinical (types of diseases and operation) factors on CHD patients' HRQOL regarding self and proxy-parents reports.

6- CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors would like to declare for not any conflict of interests.

7- ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like thanking to parents and their children who participated in the study. The authors would like also thanking to all clinical staffs as a practitioner in the project.

8- REFFRENCES

1. Noori NM, Mehralizadeh S, Khaje A. Assessment of right ventricular function in children with congenital heart disease. Doppler tissue imaging.Saudi medical journal 2008; 29(8):1168-72.

2. Rahim F, Ebadi A, Saki G, Remazani A. Prevalence of congenital heart disease in iran: a clinical study. J Med Sci 2008 Sep 15; 8(6):547-2.

3. Amorim LF, Pires CA, Lana AM, Campos ÂS, Aguiar RA, Tibúrcio JD, Siqueira AL, Mota CC, Aguiar MJ. Presentation of congenital heart disease diagnosed at birth: analysis of 29,770 newborn infants. Jornal de pediatria 2008; 84(1):83-90.

4. Moons P, Van Deyk K, Marquet K, Raes E, De Bleser L, Budts W, De Geest S. Individual quality of life in adults with congenital heart disease: a paradigm shift. European Heart Journal 2005 1; 26(3):298-307.

5. Bellinger DC, Wypij D, duPlessis AJ, et al. Neurodevelopmental status at eight years in children with dextro-transposition of the great arteries: the Boston Circulatory Arrest Trial. J ThoracCardiovasc Surg. 2003; 126(5):1385–96.

6. Mahle WT, Clancy RR, Moss EM, Gerdes M, Jobes DR, Wernovsky G. Neurodevelopmental outcome and lifestyle assessment in school-aged and adolescent children with hypoplastic left heart syndrome. Pediatrics 2000; 105(5):1082–89.

7. World Health Organization. Constitution of the World Health Organization basic document. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1948.

8. Drotar D. Measuring health-related quality of life in children and adolescents. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum; 1998).

9. Thorrington D, Eames K. Measuring health utilities in children and adolescents: a systematic review of the literature. PloS one 2015 14; 10(8):e0135672.

10. Higginson IJ, Carr AJ. Measuring quality of life: using quality of life measures in the clinical setting. BMJ. 2001; 322(7297):1297–1300

11. Janse AJ, Uiterwaal CS, Gemke RJ, Kimpen JL, Sinnema G. A difference in perception of quality of life in chronically ill children was found between parents and pediatricians. J Clin Epidemiol 2005; 58(5):495–502.

12. Uzark K, Jones K, Slusher J, Limberts CA, Burwinkle TM: Quality of life in children with heart disease as perceived by children and parents. Pediatrics 2008; 121:e1060–e1067.

13. Moons P, Van Deyk K, De Geest S, Gewillig M, Budts W: Is the severity of congenital heart disease associated with the quality of life and perceived health of adult patients. Heart 2005; 91:1193–98.

14. Cohen M, Mansoor D, Langut H, Lorber A: Quality of life, depressed mood, self-esteem in adolescents with heart disease. Psychosom Med 2007; 69:313–18.

15. McCrindle BW, Williams RV, Mitchell PD, Hsu DT, Paridon SM, Atz AM, et al. Relationship of patient and medical characteristics to health status in children and adolescents after the Fontan procedure. Circulation 2006; 113:1123-29.

16. Ternestedt BM,Wall K, Oddsson H, et al. Quality of life 20 and 30 years after surgery in patients operated on for tetralogy of Fallot and for atrial septal defect. PediatrCardiol2001; 22:128–32.

17. Berkes A, Pataki I, Kiss M, Kemény C, Kardos L, Varni JW, Mogyorósy G:Measuring health-related quality of life in Hungarian children version of the pediatric quality of life inventoryTM 4.0 generic core scales and the cardiac module. Health Qual Life Outcomes 2010, 8:14.

18. Solans M, Pane S, Estrada MD, Serra-Sutton V, Berra S, Herdman M, et al. Healthrelated quality of life measurement in children and adolescents: a systematic review of generic and disease-specific instruments. Value Health. 2008; 11(4):742-64.

19. Varni JW, Burwinkle TM, Seid M, Skarr D. The PedsQL 4.0 as a pediatric population health measure: feasibility, reliability, and validity. AmbulPediatr 2003; 3: 329-41.

20. Karsdorp PA, Everaerd W, Kindt M, Mulder BJ. Psychological and cognitive functioning in children and adolescents with congenital heart disease: a meta-analysis. J PediatrPsychol 2007; 32: 527-41.

21. Teixeira FM, Coelho RM, Proença C, Silva AM, Vieira D, Vaz C, Moura C, Viana V, Areias JC, Areias ME. Quality of life experienced by adolescents and young adults with congenital heart disease. Pediatric cardiology 2011; 32(8):1132-8.

22. Landolt MA, Buechel ER, Latal B. Health-related quality of life in children and adolescents after open-heart surgery.The Journal of pediatrics 2008 Mar 31; 152(3):349-55.

23. Ingerski LM, Modi AC, Hood KK, et al. Health-related quality of life across pediatricchronic conditions. J Pediatr 2010; 156:639-44.

24. Brosig CL, Mussatto KA, Kuhn EM, Tweddell JS. Psychosocial outcomes for preschool children and families after surgery for complex congenital heart disease.Pediatric cardiology 2007; 28(4):255-62.

25. Spijkerboer AW, Utens EM, De Koning WB, Bogers AJ, Helbing WA, Verhulst FC. Health-related quality of life in children and adolescents after invasive treatment for congenital heart disease.Quality of life research 2006; 15(4):663-73.

26. Lawoko S, Soares JJF. Quality of life among parents of children with congenital heart disease, parents of children with other diseases, and parents of healthy children. Quality of Life Research 2003; 12: 655–66.

27. MA, Buechel ER, Latal B. Healthrelated quality of life in children and adolescents after open-heart surgery. The Journal of pediatrics 2008; 152(3):349-55. 28. Eiser C, Vance YH, Horne B, Glaser A, Galvin H. The value of the PedsQLTM in assessing quality of life in survivors of childhood cancer. Child: care, health and development 2003; 29(2):95-102.

29. Arafa MA, Zaher SR, El-Dowaty AA, Moneeb DE.Quality of life among parents of children with heart disease.Health and Quality of Life Outcomes 2008; 6(1):1.

30. Knowles RL, Day T, Wade A, Bull C, Wren C, Dezateux C. Patient-reported quality of life outcomes for children with serious congenital heart defects. Arch Dis Child 2014;0:1–7. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2013-305130.

31. Krol Y, Grootenhuis MA, DestrÉe-Vonk A, Lubbers LJ, Koopman HM, Last BF. Health related quality of life in children with congenital heart disease. Psychology and Health. 2003; 18(2):251-60.

32. DeMASO DR, Beardslee WR, Silbert AR, Fyler DC. Psychological functioning in children with cyanotic heart defects. Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics 1990; 11(6): 289-94.

33. Tahirović E, Begić H, Nurkić M, Tahirović H, Varni JW. Does the severity of congenital heart defects affect disease-specific health-related quality of life in children in Bosnia and Herzegovina? European journal of pediatrics 2010; 169(3):349-53.

34. Berkes A, Varni JW, Pataki I, Kardos L, Kemény C, Mogyorósy G. Measuring health-related quality of life in Hungarian children attending a cardiology clinic with the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory[™]. European journal of pediatrics 2010; 169(3): 333-47.

35. Manlhiot C, Knezevich S, Radojewski E, Cullen-Dean G, Williams WG, Mccrindle BW. Functional health status of adolescents after the Fontan procedure–comparison with their siblings. Canadian Journal of Cardiology. 2009; 25(9): S294-300.

36. Mussatto K, Tweddell J. Quality of life following surgery for congenital cardiac malformations in neonates and infants. Cardiol Young 2005; 15(Supp.1):174-78.