Medical Science 2017; Dec, Vol-5(4):44-47

Sathian B¹, Roy B², Banerjee I³, Rajesh E⁴, Singh A⁵

Influence of sources of diabetes related information

on awareness among Pokhara residents of Nepal

Correspondence to:

drsathian@gmail.com

¹Dr. Brijesh Sathian Academic Research Associate, Trauma Surgery, Hamad General Hospital, Doha, Qatar

²Dr. Bedanta Roy, Senior Lecturer, Physiology, Department of Physiology, QIUP, Perak, Malaysia.

³Dr. Indrajit Banerjee, Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Chitwan Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Chitwan, Nepal.

⁴Dr. Rajesh E, Asst Professor, School of Behavioural Sciences, MG University, Kerala.

⁵Dr. Aakashdeep Singh, Intern, Manipal College of Medical Sciences, Pokhara, Nepal

Information about the article

Received: Sep. 1, 2017 *Revised:* Oct. 8, 2017 *Accepted:* Oct 23, 2017 *Published online:* Dec 30, 2017

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.29387/ms.2017.5.4.44-47

Abstract

Background

Diabetes is a major public health problem in the world. It is now found that it imposes a heavy disease burden in both developed and developing countries. The objective of this study was to find out the relationship between the source of information regarding diabetes mellitus and its awareness among the residents of Pokhara valley, Nepal.

Methods

It was a cross-sectional study conducted in Pokhara, Nepal from January to March 2017. The survey was conducted using a predesigned questionnaire. The tools used were demographic proforma and knowledge questionnaire on Diabetes mellitus.

Results

40.8% of the participants were of age 20-44yrs and 52.5% of them were male. Majority of them were Hindu (81.7%) and most of the participants belonged to Brahmin ethnicity (53.3%). 50.8% had nuclear family and 87.5.6% of the participants were literate. Majority of the participants were employed (70.8%). Most of them had a monthly family income of NRs.20, 001 and above (63.3%).Majority of them were non diabetic (83.3%).There was a statistically significant relationship between awareness and source of information regarding diabetes mellitus (p<0.05).

Conclusion

Awareness was found more in participants where healthcare workers were the source of information. Therefore, Nepal government and the related organizations have to gear up community based interventional programmes to increase awareness regarding Diabetes.

Key words

Awareness, Diabetes mellitus, Nepal



Background

Diabetes is progressively common in several countries and has been a potential risk factor for several diseases which lead to death [1, 2]. Diabetes patients have two-fold excess risk for a wide range of vascular diseases [2, 3]. Diabetes consequences can be avoided or delayed with physical activity, medication, diet and regular screening and treatment for complications [1-4].

Several clinical trials have reported that there is a possibility to prevent the onset of diabetes in many individuals at high risk [5, 6]. Community-based interventional programmes can prevent diabetes. So, It is better to expand diabetes prevention services [7]. The objective of this study was to find out the relationship between the source of information regarding diabetes mellitus and its awareness among the residents of Pokhara valley, Nepal.

Material and Methods

Study design, participants

This was a cross sectional questionnaire based study carried out at Pokhara, Kaski, Nepal.

Study Period

This study was conducted between 1^{st} January 2017 to 1^{st} March 2017.

Response Rate

Out of 500 participants 480 completed the questionnaire completely.

Questionnaire design

The questionnaire consisted of the information regarding demographic proforma, and awareness questionnaire on Diabetes mellitus. Awareness in this study was defined as understanding of information regarding diabetes on 16 items in the questionnaire.

Validity of the Questionnaire

Questionnaire validation test reported a Cronbach Alpha of 0.72.

Inclusion criteria

Those who are willing to participate, all age group and sex.

Exclusion criteria

Those who are not willing to participate.

Sample size calculation

Preceding to the study, from the review and literature it is found that knowledge [good+ average] of diabetes among

the residents of Nepal from a small cross-sectional study was 80%. P=80%, Q=20%, Allowable Error5%. Required sample size for 95% CI was 109. We got adequate sample size of 480 [8, 9].

Outcome variable

The main outcome variable was the awareness regarding diabetes mellitus.

Explanatory variables

Factors which were taken into consideration were demographic factors and sources of information regarding diabetes mellitus.

Ethical committee approval

Ethics approval was obtained prior to the commencement of the study from the Institutional Research and Ethics Committee of Manipal College of Medical Sciences, Pokhara, Nepal. Completed questionnaires were collected on the same day. Participants were given a choice to decide whether to participate in the study or not.

Data management and statistical analysis

The data were analyzed using Epi Info version 7.2, Division of Health Informatics & Surveillance (DHIS), Center for Surveillance, Epidemiology & Laboratory Services (CSELS).Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road Atlanta, GA30329-4027, USA. Chi square test was used to find out the relationship between different variables. p<0.05 was considered as statistically significant..

Results

Data presented in Table 1 shows that 40.8% of the participants were of age 20-44yrs and 52.5% of them were male. Majority of them were Hindu (81.7%) and most of the participants belonged to Brahmin ethnicity (53.3%). 50.8% had nuclear family and87.5.6% of the participants were literate. Majority of the participants were employed (70.8%). Most of them had a monthly family income of NRs.20, 001 and above (63.3%).Majority of them were non diabetic (83.3%).

Table 2 depicts that there was a statistically significant relationship between Knowledge and source of information regarding diabetes mellitus (p<0.05).

Discussion

Evidence from this study revealed that the knowledge regarding diabetes were inconsistent with source of information. Awareness was more among the people who



had known about this from healthcare workers followed by family and friends.

Sample characteristics Frequency Percentage Age 196 40.8 20-44yrs 196 40.8 45-64yrs 132 27.5 65-74yrs 116 24.2 >75yrs 36 7.5 Gender	Table 1:Socio demographic characteristics						
20-44yrs 196 40.8 45-64yrs 132 27.5 65-74yrs 116 24.2 >75yrs 36 7.5 Gender 228 47.5 Male 252 52.5 Religion 92 81.7 Hindu 392 81.7 Buddhist 64 13.3 Christian 24 5.0 Ethnicity 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family 12.5 10.8 Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 12.5 Literate 60 12.5 Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 44ath status Diabetic 80	Sample characteristics	Frequency	Percentage				
45-64yrs 132 27.5 65-74yrs 116 24.2 >75yrs 36 7.5 Gender - - Female 228 47.5 Male 252 52.5 Religion - - Hindu 392 81.7 Buddhist 64 13.3 Christian 24 5.0 Ethnicity - - Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family - - Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education - - Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status - - Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income	Age						
65-74yrs 116 24.2 >75yrs 36 7.5 Gender	20-44yrs	196	40.8				
>75yrs 36 7.5 Gender	45-64yrs	132	27.5				
Gender Female 228 47.5 Male 252 52.5 Religion 1 1 Hindu 392 81.7 Buddhist 64 13.3 Christian 24 5.0 Ethnicity 1 1 Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family 1 1 Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 1 1 Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status 1 1 Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 1 20,000 and below 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 <td>65-74yrs</td> <td>116</td> <td>24.2</td>	65-74yrs	116	24.2				
Female 228 47.5 Male 252 52.5 Religion 392 81.7 Buddhist 64 13.3 Christian 24 5.0 Ethnicity 52 10.8 Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family 10.16.7 10.8 Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 11 11 Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status 16.7 16.7	>75yrs	36	7.5				
Male 252 52.5 Religion	Gender						
Religion Hindu 392 81.7 Buddhist 64 13.3 Christian 24 5.0 Ethnicity 5.0 Ethnicity Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family 10.16.7 Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 12.5 Literate 60 12.5 Employment status 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status Diabetic 80 16.7 16.7	Female	228	47.5				
Hindu39281.7Buddhist6413.3Christian245.0Ethnicity5210.8Brahmin25653.3Chhetri5210.8Newar9219.2Others8016.7Type of family24450.8Joint23649.2Level of education12.5Literate6012.5Employment status50.8Employed34070.8Unemployed14029.2Family income20,000 and below176NRs.20,001 & above30463.3Health status50.816.7	Male	252	52.5				
Buddhist 64 13.3 Christian 24 5.0 Ethnicity 50 Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family 70.8 100 Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 12.5 100 Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status 70.8 100 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 120,000 and below 176 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status 10 16.7	Religion						
Christian 24 5.0 Ethnicity 53.3 Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family 70.8 1000 Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 12.5 Literate 60 12.5 Literate 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 120,000 and below 176 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status 16.7 16.7	Hindu	392	81.7				
Ethnicity Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 12.5 11 Illiterate 60 12.5 Employment status 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 14ealth status Diabetic 80 16.7 16.7	Buddhist	64	13.3				
Brahmin 256 53.3 Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status Diabetic 80 16.7	Christian	24	5.0				
Chhetri 52 10.8 Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status Diabetic 80 16.7	Ethnicity						
Newar 92 19.2 Others 80 16.7 Type of family Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status Diabetic 80 16.7	Brahmin	256	53.3				
Others 80 16.7 Type of family	Chhetri	52	10.8				
Type of family Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 12.5 Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status 50.8 12.5 Unemployed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 142 Diabetic 80 16.7 16.7	Newar	92	19.2				
Nuclear 244 50.8 Joint 236 49.2 Level of education 12.5 Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status 50.8 100 Unemployed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 304 63.3 Health status 50.8 16.7	Others	80	16.7				
Joint 236 49.2 Level of education	Type of family						
Level of education Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status Jiabetic 80 16.7 16.7	Nuclear	244	50.8				
Illiterate 60 12.5 Literate 420 87.5 Employment status 87.5 Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 304 63.3 Health status 504 63.3 Health status 16.7	Joint	236	49.2				
Literate 420 87.5 Employment status Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status 50 16.7	Level of education						
Employment status Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status Diabetic 80 16.7	Illiterate	60	12.5				
Employed 340 70.8 Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status Diabetic 80 16.7	Literate	420	87.5				
Unemployed 140 29.2 Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status 500 16.7	Employment status						
Family income 20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status 5000000000000000000000000000000000000	Employed	340	70.8				
20,000 and below 176 36.7 NRs.20,001 & above 304 63.3 Health status 500 16.7	Unemployed	140	29.2				
NRs.20,001 & above30463.3Health status5016.7	Family income						
Health statusDiabetic8016.7	20,000 and below	176	36.7				
Diabetic 80 16.7	NRs.20,001 & above	304	63.3				
	Health status						
Non diabetic 400 83.3	Diabetic	80	16.7				
	Non diabetic	400	83.3				

Table2:Comparison of awareness and source of information							
Variables		Knowledge			P value		
		Poor	Average	good			
Diabetes	NO	90 (22.5)	280 (70)	30 (7.5)	0.0025*		
	YES	30 (37.5)	40 (50)	10 (12.5)			
Source of							
Knowledge							
Family/	NO	60 (21.4)	180 (64.3)	40 (14.3)	0.0001*		
Friends	YES	60 (30)	140 (70)	0 (0)			
Healthcare	NO	120	260 (68.4)	0 (0)	0.0001*		
workers		(31.6)					
	YES	0 (0)	60 (60)	40 (40)			
Mass	NO	100 (27)	230 (62.2)	40 (10.8)	0.0001*		
media	YES	20 (18.2)	90 (81.8)	0 (0)			
Others	NO	80 (20)	280 (70)	40 (10)	0.0001*		
	YES	40 (50)	40 (50)	0 (0)			

*P<0.01 statistically significant

Another study from Oman showed that 61% of the students favored healthcare professional to provide the information regarding diabetes, but contrary to our study common source of information were mass media [10]. Similar to our study, Health Information National Trends Survey in USA reported that 62.4% of the adults were in favor of physicians as a trusted information source. Health care professionals talks and seminars should be recommended as an effective source to improve diabetes-related awareness among the residents of Pokhara valley of Nepal [11].

Conclusion

Awareness regarding diabetes was inconsistent with the source of information. Most of the participants were in favor of physicians as a trusted information source. Therefore, Nepal government and the related organizations have to gear up community based interventional programmes to increase good knowledge regarding Diabetes.

Limitations & future scope of the study

The main drawback is the non - probability sampling technique.

Competing interests

The authors do not have any conflict of interest arising from the study.

Authors' contribution

BS, BR, RE, AS and IB designed the questionnaire, interpreted the data, drafted the manuscript, and revised it. BS conceived of the study with AS, and BS acquired & interpreted the data and revised the manuscript. BS took part in data analysis, interpreted the data, and revised the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to all the participants and Dr. B. M. Nagpal, Dean of Manipal College of Medical Sciences(MCOMS) and Research Ethical committee of MCOMS for permission to do this research work.

References

1. Danaei G, Finucane MM, Lu Y, Singh GM, Cowan MJ, Paciorek CJ, *et al.* National, regional, and global trends in fasting plasma glucose and diabetes prevalence since 1980: systematic analysis of health examination surveys and epidemiological studies



with 370 country-years and 2.7 million participants. Lancet 2011; 378:31-40.

- Rao Kondapally Seshasai S, Kaptoge S, Thompson A, Di Angelantonio E, Gao P, Sarwar N. The Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration. Diabetes mellitus, fasting glucose, and risk of cause-specific death. N Engl J Med 2011;364:829-41.
- 3. Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration1, Sarwar N, Gao P, Seshasai SR, Gobin R, Kaptoge S *et al.* Diabetes mellitus, fasting blood glucose concentration, and risk of vascular disease: a collaborative meta-analysis of 102 prospective studies. Lancet 2010;375: 2215-22.
- Yusuf S, Islam S, Chow CK, Rangarajan S, Dagenais G, Diaz R *et al.* Use of secondary prevention drugs for cardiovascular disease in the community in highincome, middle-income, and low-income countries (the PURE study): a prospective epidemiological survey. Lancet 2011;378:1231-43
- Knowler WC, Barrett-Connor E, Fowler SE, et al; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. N Engl J Med 2002;346:393–403
- Tuomilehto J, Lindstrom J, Eriksson JG, et al; "Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study Group. Prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus by changes in lifestyle among subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. N Engl J Med 2001;344:1343–1350
- Fradkin JE, Roberts BT, Rodgers GP. What's preventing us from preventing type 2 diabetes? N Engl J Med 2012;367:1177–1179.
- ChaurasiaN, Thapa B, Patil BH, Khandekar K, Angolkar M, Narasannavar A, Wantamutte AS, Karikatti SS. Knowledge of Urban Population Regarding Diabetes Mellitus and its Complication: A Community Based Study. Journal of Nobel Medical College. 2014;3(1):62-65.
- 9. Sathian B, Sreedharan J, Banerjee I, Roy B. Simple sample size calculator for medical research: a necessary tool for the researchers. Medical Science. 2014;2:141-4.
- Al-Mahrooqi B, Al-Hadhrami R, Al-Amri A, Al-Tamimi S, Al-Shidhani A, Al-Lawati H, et al. Self-reported knowledge of diabetes among high school students in Al-Amerat and Quriyat, Muscat Governate, Oman. Sultan QaboosUniv Med J 2013;13:392–8.
- 11. Hesse BW, Nelson DE, Kreps GL, Croyle RT, Arora NK, Rimer BK, *et al.* Trust and sources of health information: the impact of the Internet and its implications for healthcare providers: findings from the first Health Information National Trends Survey. Arch Intern Med 2005;165:2618–24.