

18+

Национальный НИИ общественного здоровья им. Н. А. Семашко

Центральный НИИ организации и информатизации здравоохранения Минздрава России

Журнал основан в 1993 г.

С 1995 г. журнал является членом Европейской ассоциации научных редакторов (EASE).

www.journal-nriph.ru
www.nriph.ru

Зав. редакцией

Щеглова Татьяна Даниловна

Тел.: +7 (495) 916-29-60

E-mail: ttcheglova@gmail.com

Почтовый адрес: 105064, Москва, ул. Воронцово Поле, д. 12

Все права защищены.

Ни одна часть этого издания не может быть занесена в память компьютера либо воспроизведена любым способом без предварительного письменного разрешения издателя.

Цена свободная.

Подписка:

через интернет:

www.akc.ru, www.pressa-rt.ru,
www.pochta.ru

на электронную версию:
elibrary.ru

ISSN 0869-866X. Пробл. соц. гиг.,
здравоохр. и истории мед. 2024. Т. 32.
№ 6. 1209—1412.



Издатель:
Акционерное общество
«Шико»

ОГРН 1027739732822

Переводчик В. С. Нечаев

Корректор И. И. Жданюк

Сдано в набор 13.11.2024.

Подписано в печать 05.12.2024.

Формат 60 × 88%. Печать офсетная.

Печ. л. 25,5. Усл. печ. л. 24,93. Уч.-изд. л. 28,00.

Отпечатано в ПАО «Т8 Издательские Технологии», 109316, Москва, Волгоградский просп., д. 42, кор. 5.

ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ГИГИЕНЫ, ЗДРАВООХРАНЕНИЯ И ИСТОРИИ МЕДИЦИНЫ

Двухмесячный научно-практический журнал

6

Том 32

2024

НОЯБРЬ—ДЕКАБРЬ

Главный редактор:

ХАБРИЕВ Рамил Усманович — академик РАН, доктор медицинских наук, доктор фармацевтических наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

Заместители главного редактора:

ЩЕПИН Владимир Олегович — член-корреспондент РАН, доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ХОДАКОВА Ольга Владимировна — доктор медицинских наук, доцент (Москва, Российская Федерация)

ЗАТРАВКИН Сергей Наркизович — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

АНАНЧЕНКОВА Полина Игоревна — кандидат экономических наук, кандидат социологических наук, доцент (Москва, Россия)

Ответственный секретарь:

НЕЧАЕВ Василий Сергеевич — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ:

АЛЕКСАНДРОВА Оксана Юрьевна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

АЛЬБИЦКИЙ Валерий Юрьевич — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

АНДРЕЕВА Маргарита Дарчиевна — доктор медицинских наук, доцент (Краснодар, Россия)

ВЕНДТ Сара — PhD, профессор (Флиндер, Австралия)

ВИШЛЕНКОВА Елена Анатольевна — доктор исторических наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ГАЙДАРОВ Гайдар Мамедович — доктор медицинских наук, доцент (Иркутск, Россия)

ЕЛЮТИНА Марина Эдуардовна — доктор социологических наук, профессор (Саратов, Россия)

ЗУДИН Александр Борисович — доктор медицинских наук (Москва, Россия)

КАКОРИНА Екатерина Петровна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ЛИНДЕНБРАТЕН Александр Леонидович — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

МЕДИК Валерий Алексеевич — член-корреспондент РАН, доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Новгород, Россия)

ПАШКОВ Константин Анатольевич — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

РЕННЕР Андреас — PhD, профессор (Мюнхен, Германия)

СЕМЕНОВ Владимир Юрьевич — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

СОЗИНОВ Алексей Станиславович — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Казань, Россия)

СОРОКИНА Татьяна Сергеевна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

СТАРОДУБОВ Владимир Иванович — академик РАН, доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ХАЛЬФИН Руслан Альбертович — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ЧЕБОТАРЕВА Юлия Юрьевна — доктор медицинских наук, доцент (Ростов-на-Дону, Россия)

ЧИЧЕРИН Леонид Петрович — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ШЛЯФЕР София Исааковна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ЭКЛОФ Артур Бенуа — PhD, профессор (Блумингтон, США)

РЕДАКЦИОННЫЙ СОВЕТ:

АМОНОВА Дильбар Субхоновна — доктор экономических наук, доцент (Душанбе, Республика Таджикистан)

БЕРСЕНЕВА Евгения Александровна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ВИШНЯКОВ Николай Иванович — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Санкт-Петербург, Россия)

ВОЛКОВА Ольга Александровна — доктор социологических наук, профессор (Белгород, Россия)

ГЕРАСИМЕНКО Николай Федорович — академик РАН, доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ГУЛЗОДА Махмадшоҳ Курбонали — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Республика Таджикистан)

ГУНДАРОВ Игорь Алексеевич — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ДЖУМАЛИЕВА Гульмира Артыкбаевна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Бишкек, Кыргызстан)

ЗИНЧЕНКО Реза Абульфазовна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ЗУБОК Юлия Альбертовна — доктор социологических наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

КАСЫМОВА Гульнара Пазылбековна — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Алматы, Казахстан)

ПОЛУНИНА Наталья Валентиновна — член-корреспондент РАН, доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

ПОЛЯНИН Андрей Витальевич — доктор экономических наук, профессор (Орел, Россия)

РЕШЕТНИКОВ Андрей Вениаминович — академик РАН, доктор медицинских наук, доктор социологических наук, профессор (Москва, Россия)

САЛАКС Юрис — доктор медицинских наук, профессор (Рига, Латвия)

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

COVID-19

- Иванова М. А., Пенкина Н. И., Стародубов В. И., Исхакова М. К. Заболеваемость в различных возрастных группах детского населения на фоне пандемии COVID-19 и новые вызовы в организации медицинской помощи . . . 1213

Здоровье и общество

- Стародубов В. И., Ступак В. С., Маношкина Е. М. Заболеваемость взрослого населения в Российской Федерации, ее федеральных округах и субъектах в 2016—2022 гг. . . . 1220
- Калининская А. А., Лазарев А. В., Смирнов А. А., Шляфер С. И. Анализ медико-демографических показателей сельского населения 1227
- Зудин А. Б., Кузнецова М. А., Васильева Т. П., Тырановец С. В., Кузнецова К. Ю. Стратегический выбор организационных технологий превенции выгорания врачей общей практики в системе пациент-ориентированной медицины 1234
- Климов Ю. А. Эффективность телереабилитации в оценках медицинских работников 1243
- Лузанов О. А., Ольков И. Г., Гришина Н. К., Обакова С. З. Онкоскрининг заболеваний гинекологического и урологического профиля как одна из мер по сохранению женского и мужского репродуктивного здоровья (обзор) 1249
- Коротаевский Е. А., Калинин А. Г., Бутырская И. Д., Карякин А. А., Мартынова Н. А., Карякина О. Е., Баранов А. В., Лозовицкий Д. В. Сравнительный анализ заболеваемости дорсопатиями взрослого населения в Российской Федерации и в отдельных субъектах Северо-Западного федерального округа за 2013—2022 гг. 1254
- Ваняйкин Р. А., Петрова М. М., Каскаева Д. С., Пронина Е. А., Шимохина Н. Ю. Заболеваемость учащихся высших учебных заведений в условиях современного образовательного процесса и воздействия факторов среды обитания (обзор литературы) 1259
- Амлаев К. Р., Дахкильгова Х. Т., Блинкова Л. Н., Мажаров В. Н. Недостаточная физическая активность как фактор риска инфекционных заболеваний 1267
- Бельченко В. А., Чантырь И. В., Завгороднев К. Д. Стационарзамещающие технологии в челюстно-лицевой хирургии: особенности организации и пути дальнейшего развития 1273
- Оморова Г. К., Bolbachan K. N., Bolbachan O. A., Ibraimova D. D., Ibraimova A. D. The glaucoma quality of life assessment 1281
- Аххохова А. В., Бижева М. А., Альмова И. Х., Кардангушева А. М., Тлупова М. В., Тлакадугова М. Х., Шогенова Ф. М., Габараева З. Г., Байдаева А. С.-Х., Кумыков Т. Р. Исследование процессов управления региональными проектами для определения алгоритмов прототипирования (обзор) 1286
- Османов Э. М., Решетников В. А., Каграманян И. Н., Татарченко В. В., Маньяков Р. Р., Прокопов А. Ю., Блинова А. И., Жигалко Т. А., Абдуллаев А. А. О. Динамика обеспеченности населения Российской Федерации врачами-оториноларингологами за 2018—2023 гг. 1296
- Волкова О. А. Ценностные основания социального иммунитета в условиях расширяющегося российского пространства: демографический аспект 1306
- Максименко А. А., Золотарева А. А. Онлайн-грамотность россиян в вопросах информации о здоровье: психометрические свойства русскоязычной версии eHEALS . . . 1314
- Погарская А. С. Легализация параллельного импорта расходных материалов и комплектующих медицинского назначения в условиях введения принципа экстерриториальности санкций 1321
- Некотенева М. В., Пономарева Д. В., Лившиц С. А., Вепринский Д. В. Проблемы правового регулирования преемственной диагностики (преемственной диагностики скрининга) в Российской Федерации 1330

CONTENTS

COVID-19

- Ivanova M. A., Penkina N. I., Starodubov V. I., Iskhakova M. K. The morbidity in children population of various age groups against the background of COVID-19 pandemic and new challenges in organization of medical care 1213

Health and Society

- Starodubov V. I., Stupak V. S., Manoshkina E. M. The morbidity of adult population in the Russian Federation and its Federal Okrugs and Subjects in 2016–2022 1220
- Kalinskaya A. A., Lazarev A. V., Smirnov A. A., Shlyafser S. I. The analysis of medical demographic indicators of rural population 1227
- Zudin A. B., Kuznetsova M. A., Vasilyeva T. P., Tyranovets S. V., Kuznetsova K. Yu. The strategic choice of organizational technologies preventing burning out of general practitioners in the system of patient-oriented medicine 1234
- Klimov Yu. A. The efficiency of tele-rehabilitation through estimates of medical workers 1243
- Luзанov O. A., Olkov I. G., Grishina N. K., Obakova S. Z. The oncological screening of diseases of gynecological and urological profile as one of measures preventing reproductive health: A review 1249
- Korotaevskiy E. A., Kalinin A. G., Butyrskaya I. D., Karyakin A. A., Martynova N. A., Karyakina O. E., Baranov A. V., Lozovitskiy D. V. The comparative analysis of dorsopathy morbidity of adult population in the Russian Federation and separate Subjects of the Northern-West Federal Okrug in 2013–2022 1254
- Vanyaykin R. A., Petrova M. M., Kaskaeva D. S., Pronina E. A., Shimohina N. Yu. The morbidity of university students in conditions of modern educational process and impact of environmental factors: A publications review 1259
- Amlaev K. R., Dahkilgova Kh. T., Blinkova L. N., Mazharov V. N. The inadequate physical activity as risk factor of non-communicable diseases 1267
- Belchenko V. A., Chantyr I. V., Zavgorodnev K. D. The in-patient substituting technologies in maxillofacial surgery: characteristics of organization and ways of further development 1273
- Omorova G. K., Bolbachan K. N., Bolbachan O. A., Ibraimova D. D., Ibraimova A. D. The glaucoma quality of life assessment 1281
- Akhokhova A. V., Bizheva M. A., Almova I. Kh., Kardangusheva A. M., Tlupova M. V., Tlakadugova M. Kh., Shogenova F. M., Gabaraeva Z. G., Baidaeva A. S.-Kh., Kumykov T. R. The study of management processes of regional projects to determining algorithms of prototyping: A review 1286
- Osmanov E. M., Reshetnikov V. A., Kagramanyan I. N., Tatarchenko V. V., Manyakov R. R., Prokopov A. Yu., Blinova A. I., Zhigalko T. A., Abdullaev A. A. O. The dynamics of provision of population of the Russian Federation with otorhinolaryngologists in 2018–2023 1296
- Volkova O. A. The value foundations of social immunity in conditions of expanding Russian space: A demographic aspect 1306
- Maksimenko A. A., Zolotareva A. A. The online literacy of Russian citizen in issues of health information: psychometric characteristics of Russian version of eHEALS 1314
- Pogarskaya A. S. The legalization of parallel import of expendables and components of medical purpose in conditions of implementation of principle of ex-territorial sanctions 1321
- Nekoteneva M. V., Ponomareva D. V., Livshits S. A., Vepriinskiy D. V. The problems of legal regulation of per-conception diagnostics (per-conception screening) in the Russian Federation 1330

Omorova G. K.¹, Bolbachan K. N.², Bolbachan O. A.³, Ibraimova D. D.^{3,4}, Ibraimova A. D.⁴

THE GLAUCOMA QUALITY OF LIFE ASSESSMENT

¹The International Higher School of Medicine, 720054, Bishkek, the Kyrgyz Republic;

²The Federal Medical Biological Agency of Russia, 123182, Moscow, Russia;

³The B. N. Yeltsin Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University, 720000, Bishkek, the Kyrgyz Republic;

⁴The I. K. Akhunbayev Kyrgyz State Medical Academy, 720000, Bishkek, the Kyrgyz Republic

In the next 15 years, expected increase in incidence of glaucoma is predicted. The glaucoma results in changes of quality of life of patients deteriorating in parallel with progression of stage of disease. The presence of many concomitant diseases in patients has significant impact on survival, exacerbations, hospitalizations and quality of life of patients. The impact of glaucoma on implementation of everyday human activities determines relevance of studying issues of quality of life. The physical state of health level of males is lower than that of females. The vision of both eyes is higher in males than in females. The overall assessment of vision in case of glaucoma causes pronounced decrease in visual function both in males and females. The most patients with glaucoma suffer with decrease in performance and restriction of work. The irritation occurs especially in males and females have uncomfortable relationships due to eye pain and less housework due to vision problems. The overall assessment of vision in case of glaucoma causes violation of visual perception. The social and psychological components affecting quality of life are violated that affects both mental and physical health.

Key words: glaucoma; vision; quality of life; visual impairment; open-angle glaucoma; blindness.

For citation: Omorova G. K., Bolbachan K. N., Bolbachan O. A., Ibraimova D. D., Ibraimova A. D. The glaucoma quality of life assessment. *Problemi socialnoi gigieni, zdravookhraneniya i istorii meditsini*. 2024;32(6):1281–1285 (In Russ.). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32687/0869-866X-2024-32-6-1281-1285>

For correspondence: Ibraimova D. D., the associate professor of the Department of Public Health and Health of the B. N. Yeltsin Kyrgyz-Russian Slavic University. e-mail: ibraimova_70@mail.ru

Conflict of interests. The authors declare absence of conflict of interests.

Acknowledgment. The study had no sponsor support.

Received 15.05.2024

Accepted 10.09.2024

Introduction

At least 2.2 billion people worldwide suffer from visual impairment human. At least 1 billion or almost half of these people's visual impairments could have been prevented or could still be corrected [1].

The main diseases causing long-range vision disorders and blindness among these 1 billion people cataract (94 million), refractive error (88.4 million), age-related macular degeneration (8 million), glaucoma (7.7 million) and diabetic retinopathy (3.9 million) [2].

In recent years, there has been an increase in the number of cases of primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG), which occupies a leading place in the structure of eye diseases among the adult population of the Russian Federation, including among people of working age [3–5].

In general, it is not possible to assess the nature of the course of the disease due to the limited provision of official data (prevalence and morbidity). According to these indicators, it is difficult to imagine the scale of this problem in the country [6, 7].

For the first time, POAG is detected in more than 50% of cases at advanced and far-advanced stages [8].

The results of the study by Movsisyan A. B. et al. (2022) demonstrated an expected increase in the incidence and prevalence of glaucoma in the next 15 years. Due to this, an increase in visual disability should be expected, and consequently, a rapid loss of performance in patients of different age groups due to the delay in diagnosis and the start of treatment [9]. Therefore, the assessment of the quality of life should become one of the main tasks of the healthcare system aimed at improving

the effectiveness of clinical and diagnostic examination of the patient [10–14].

The results obtained during the study conducted by Voronina A. E. et al. (2014) indicate that glaucoma is most common in respondents of working age, and cataracts with glaucoma are combined in patients over 60 years of age. There was a decrease in the quality of life of glaucoma patients and a lower quality of life of patients with a combination of cataract and glaucoma in all spheres of life. Along with objective methods of assessing the health status of patients with glaucoma, it is necessary to conduct a subjective assessment of the quality of life of this group of patients [15].

As noted by Gabdrakhmanova A. F. et al. (2013), glaucoma leads to a change in the quality of life of patients, it worsens in parallel with the progression of the disease stage [16]. According to Kurbanov S. A. et al. (2014), the quality of life of patients with primary open-angle glaucoma is characterized by low overall indicators on the scales: general health, general assessment of vision, peripheral vision, social functioning, mental health and role limitations [17].

The World Health Organization (WHO), in the World Vision Report (2019), as well as the resolution “Comprehensive human-centered ophthalmic care, including the fight against preventable blindness and preventable visual impairment”, adopted at the seventy-third session of the World Health Assembly in 2020, notes the provision of comprehensive and human-centered ophthalmic care assistance as the preferred model and the widespread adoption of this model in countries [18].

In the treatment of glaucoma, it is necessary to pay attention to the diagnosis and treatment of concomitant pathology, since the presence of many concomitant diseases has a significant impact on survival, the frequency of exacerbations and hospitalizations, and the quality of life of patients [19].

Visual impairment has a severe negative impact on the quality of life of adults. Adults with visual impairments are more likely to experience problems with employment and are more likely to suffer from depression and anxiety disorders [1, 14].

Visual impairments in older people can exacerbate social isolation, cause difficulty walking, increase the risk of falls and fractures, as well as the likelihood of earlier placement in nursing homes and long-term care facilities.

Undoubtedly, the influence of glaucoma on the implementation of daily human actions determines the relevance of studying the quality of life.

Materials and methods

A survey was conducted of 318 patients before glaucoma treatment who applied to the eye microsurgery department of the National Hospital of the Ministry of Health of the Kyrgyz Republic using an adapted questionnaire. The quality of life of 318 patients before glaucoma treatment who applied to the eye microsurgery department of the National Hospital of the Ministry of Health of the Kyrgyz Republic was studied, of whom 49.1% ($n=156$) were men and 50.9% ($n=162$) were women.

The results of the study

The physical component of men was assessed as a satisfactory state of health — 29.8 ± 2.5 ($n=95$), those of women were slightly higher — 31.1 ± 2.5 ($n=99$), $p>0.05$, while no significant difference in responses was revealed (Table 1).

Good health was found in 15.4 ± 2.0 ($n=49$) men and 15.0 ± 2.1 ($n=54$) women, also without significant difference, $p>0.05$.

Poor health, according to patients, was more often noted by men — 3.8 ± 2.0 ($n=12$) than by women — 2.8 ± 0.9 ($n=9$), $p>0.05$.

The assessment of the vision of both eyes showed that the majority of men surveyed were more likely to indicate poor eyesight — 21.4 ± 2.2 ($n=68$) than women — 8.1 ± 1.5 ($n=108$), which indicates a greater reliabil-

ity of differences, $p<0.001$. Whereas, in a significant proportion of women, 34.0 ± 2.6 ($n=108$) satisfactory vision was observed, and men with satisfactory vision were 16.7 ± 2.0 ($n=53$), $p<0.001$.

It should be noted that men had good eyesight more often than women (11.0 ± 1.7 , $n=35$ and 8.8 ± 1.5 , $n=28$, respectively), $p>0.05$.

The overall assessment of the quality of life (Table 2) of patients related to visual function showed that many indicators were reduced. Visual impairment was more often observed in men than in women who stopped reading due to vision problems — 4.4 ± 1.1 ($n=14$) and 2.2 ± 0.8 ($n=7$), $p>0.05$, and most men and women indicated in the questionnaire that it was not difficult for them to read — 25.5 ± 2.4 ($n=81$) and 27.4 ± 2.4 ($n=87$), $p>0.05$. Approximately equal answers were given by men and women on the question that sometimes there are extreme difficulties with reading in 19.2 ± 2.2 ($n=61$) and 21.3 ± 2.2 ($n=68$), $p>0.05$.

For the majority of patients, doing what they love was not affected by the disease and related vision problems (37.7 ± 2.7 ($n=120$) men and 29.8 ± 2.5 ($n=95$) women, respectively), $p>0.05$.

Women are more likely (17.6 ± 2.1 , $n=56$) than men (8.5 ± 0.9 , $n=27$) with high confidence, it is extremely difficult to do what they love in everyday life, $p<0.001$. Almost the same number of men and women stopped doing what they love (2.8 ± 0.9 , $n=9$ and 3.5 ± 1.0 , $n=11$, respectively), $p>0.05$.

Vision problems for 30.2 ± 2.5 ($n=96$) men and 25.5 ± 2.4 ($n=81$) women did not affect minor repairs in the house, $p>0.05$. But for 18.3 ± 2.1 ($n=58$) women and 12.2 ± 1.8 ($n=39$) men, it is extremely difficult to carry out even minor repairs, $p>0.05$ and only 6.6 ± 1.3 ($n=21$) men and 7.2 ± 1.4 ($n=23$) women cannot carry out repairs, due to vision problems, $p>0.05$.

Ophthalmological problems associated with glaucoma in the early stages of the disease do not cause difficulty in finding an item on the shelf. This was noted by 26.1 ± 2.4 ($n=83$) men and 24.6 ± 2.4 ($n=78$) women, $p>0.05$. It is extremely difficult to do this for 10.4 ± 1.7 ($n=33$) women and 6.9 ± 1.4 ($n=22$) men, $p>0.05$. They cannot find at all, especially small objects 16.0 ± 2.0 ($n=51$) men and women, $p>0.05$.

Difficulties in reading street signs were positively responded to by 24.5 ± 2.4 ($n=78$) men, 21.7 ± 2.3 ($n=69$), $p>0.05$ women with glaucoma. It does not cause particular difficulty when reading street signs 17.0 ± 2.1

Table 1

Assessment of the quality of life before treatment ($n=318$)

№	Criteria	Men ($n=156$)						Women ($n=162$)					
		Good		Satisfactory		Bad		Good		Satisfactory		Bad	
		The absolute number	$P \pm m$	The absolute number	$P \pm m$	The absolute number	$P \pm m$	The absolute number	$P \pm m$	The absolute number	$P \pm m$	The absolute number	$P \pm m$
1	The state of your health	49	15.4 ± 2.0	95	29.8 ± 2.5	12	3.8 ± 2.0	54	$17.0 \pm 2.1^*$	99	$31.1 \pm 2.5^*$	9	$2.8 \pm 0.9^*$
2	Vision of both eyes	35	11.0 ± 1.7	53	16.7 ± 2.0	68	21.4 ± 2.2	28	$8.8 \pm 1.5^*$	108	$34.0 \pm 2.6^{**}$	26	$8.1 \pm 1.5^{**}$

Note. $P \pm m$ is an intensive indicator and an error of representativeness; * — $p>0.05$; ** — $p<0.001$.

Table 2

General assessment of vision (n=318)													
№	Criteria	Men (n=156)						Women (n=162)					
		It's not difficult		Extremely difficult		They stopped because of their eyesight		It's not difficult		Extremely difficult		They stopped because of their eyesight	
		The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m
1	Difficulty reading	81	25.5±2.4	61	19.2±2.2	14	4.4±1.1	87	27.4±2.4*	68	21.3±2.2*	7	2.2±0.8
2	Doing what you love	120	37.7±2.7	27	8.5±1.5	9	2.8±0.9	95	29.8±2.5**	56	17.6±2.1**	11	3.5±1.0
3	Minor repairs in the house	96	30.2±2.5	39	12.2±1.8	21	6.6±1.3	81	25.5±2.4	58	18.3±2.1*	23	7.2±1.4
4	Difficulty finding anything on the shelf	83	26.1±2.4	22	6.9±1.4	51	16.0±2.0	78	24.6±2.4*	33	10.4±1.7	51	16.0±2.0
5	Difficulty reading street signs	47	14.8±2.0	78	24.5±2.4	31	9.7±1.6	54	17.0±2.1*	69	21.7±2.3*	39	12.3±1.8*
6	It's hard to walk down the stairs	59	18.5±2.1	97	30.5±2.5	—	—	82	25.8±2.4*	73	23.0±2.3*	7	2.2±0.8
7	It is difficult to notice objects on the sides	26	8.1±1.5	101	31.7±2.6	29	9.1±1.6	31	9.8±1.6*	98	30.9±2.5*	33	10.4±1.7*
8	The difficulty of choosing clothes	83	26.1±2.4	59	18.5±2.1	14	4.4±1.1	65	20.5±2.2*	18	5.7±1.3**	79	24.8±2.4
9	Difficulty communicating with people	128	40.2±2.7	28	8.8±1.5	—	—	151	47.5±2.8*	9	2.8±0.9**	2	0.7±0.4
10	It's hard to go to the cinema	29	9.1±1.6	103	32.4±2.6	24	7.5±1.4	58	18.3±2.1	24	7.5±1.4	80	25.2±2.4**
11	The difficulty of driving cars	67	21.0±2.2	31	9.7±1.6	58	18.3±2.1	28	8.8±1.5	22	7.0±1.4*	112	35.2±2.6*
12	The difficulty of driving a car at night and in bad weather	57	17.9±2.1	24	7.5±1.4	75	23.6±2.3	24	7.5±1.4	21	6.6±1.3*	117	36.8±2.7*

Note. P±m is an intensive indicator and an error of representativeness.

(n=54) for women and 14.8±2.0 (n=47) for men, $p>0.05$. 9.7±1.6 (n=31) men and 12.3±1.8 (n=39) women cannot read street signs, $p>0.05$.

Unfortunately, a disease such as glaucoma for 30.5±2.5 (n=97) men and 23.0±2.3 (n=73) women causes difficulty moving up stairs, $p>0.05$. Women were more likely to respond (25.8±2.4, n=82) than men (18.5±2.1, n=59), that the disease does not yet affect their movements, $p>0.05$, and 2.2±0.8 (n=7) women cannot move down the stairs at all, no such men have been identified.

Almost the same answers were given by men and women on the question "It is difficult to notice objects on the sides". It is extremely difficult to do this for 31.7±2.6 (n=101) men and 30.9±2.5 (n=98) women, $p>0.05$. It is not difficult to look in both directions 8.1±1.5 (n=26) for men and 9.8±1.6 (n=31) for women, $p>0.05$. They do not notice objects on the sides of 9.1±1.6 (n=29) and 10.4±1.7 (n=33) women, $p>0.05$.

It should be noted that the disease does not cause difficulty in choosing clothes, both for 26.1±2.4 (n=83) men and 20.5±2.2 (n=65) women, $p>0.05$. It is extremely difficult to choose clothes indicated by 18.5±2.1 (n=59) men and only 5.7±1.3 (n=18) women, $p<0.001$. 24.8±2.4 (n=79) women and only 4.4±1.1 (n=14) men, $p<0.001$, cannot make a choice of clothes.

Glaucoma did not affect communication with people, 40.2±2.7 (n=128) men and 47.5±2.8 (n=151) women indicated it was not difficult to communicate, $p>0.05$. It became extremely difficult to communicate mainly for men — 8.8±1.5 (n=28) and only 2.8±0.9 (n=9) for women, $p<0.001$. For this reason, 0.7±0.4 (n=2) women do not communicate, no such men were identified.

It is extremely difficult to visit the cinema due to the disease, this was noted by 32.4±2.6 (n=103) men, and

there are much fewer women — 7.5±1.4 (n=24), $p<0.001$. Stopped visiting the cinema due to vision problems 25.2±2.4 (n=80) women and 7.5±1.4 (n=24) men, $p<0.001$. Out of the total number of respondents, it is not difficult to watch movies in the cinema 9.1±1.6 (n=29) men and 18.3±2.1 (n=58) women, $p>0.05$.

The difficulties of driving a car and in this regard, extreme difficulties were noted by 9.7±1.6 (n=31) men and 7.0±1.4 (n=22) women, $p>0.05$, most of them cannot travel by car 18.3±2.1 (n=58) and 35.2±2.6 (n=112), $p>0.05$. It is not difficult to drive a car — 21.0±2.2 (n=67) for men and 8.8±1.5 (n=28) for women, $p<0.001$.

The difficulty of driving at night and in bad weather was noted by 7.5±1.4 (n=24) and 6.6±1.3 (n=21) men and women, $p>0.05$. Whereas, for most men — 17.9±2.1 (n=57) and 7.5±1.4 (n=24) women does not cause driving difficulties, $p>0.05$. It should be noted that 23.6±2.3 (n=75) men and 36.8±2.7 (n=117) women cannot drive a car under these circumstances, $p>0.05$.

Vision problems in glaucoma cause significant changes in the quality of life in the social and household sphere (Table 3). The majority of women — 33.7±2.6 (n=107) than men — 29.2±2.5 (n=93), $p>0.05$ noted that due to vision problems it is often possible to do less scheduled homework. Responses were received with the same frequency from men and women who noted "sometimes" they perform less various household chores — 10.7±1.7 (n=34) and 9.4±1.6 (n=30), $p>0.05$ and rarely 9.1±1.6 (n=29) and 7.9±1.5 (n=25), $p>0.05$.

Visual impairments often cause work restrictions in 36.8±2.7 (n=117) men and 18.5±2.1 (n=59) women, $p>0.05$. Rare limitations in activity were observed in 8.5±1.5 (n=27) men and 10.1±1.6 (n=32) women, $p>0.05$. Women were more likely to respond that ophthalmological problems sometimes occurred in 22.3±2.3

Table 3

The social component of the quality of life of glaucoma patients (n=318)

№	Criteria	Men (n=156)						Women (n=162)					
		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Often		Sometimes		Rarely	
		The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m	The absolute number	P±m
1	Due to vision problems, it is possible to do less	93	29.2±2.5	34	10.7±1.7	29	9.1±1.6	107	33.7±2.6*	30	9.4±1.6*	25	7.9±1.5*
2	Limitation of work	117	36.8±2.7	12	3.8±1.0	27	8.5±1.5	59	18.5±2.1*	71	22.3±2.3**	32	10.1±1.6*
3	Uncomfortable relationships due to eye pain	85	26.7±2.4	58	18.3±2.1	13	4.0±1.0	127	40.0±2.7*	24	7.5±1.4**	11	3.5±1.0*
4	Irritability	99	31.1±2.5	21	6.6±1.3	36	11.3±1.7	64	20.2±2.2*	61	19.2±2.2**	37	11.6±1.7*
5	The necessary help from others	82	25.8±2.4	35	11.0±1.7	39	12.2±1.8	33	10.4±1.7**	78	24.6±2.4**	51	16.0±2.0*

(n=71), and in men in 3.8 ± 1.0 (n=12) in cases, $p < 0.001$. Women also experience uncomfortable relationships with others more often — 40.0 ± 2.7 (n=127) than men — 26.7 ± 2.4 (n=85), $p > 0.05$. Uncomfortable relationships caused by pain occur in 18.3 ± 2.1 (n=58) men and 7.5 ± 1.4 (n=24) women, $p < 0.001$ and rarely such problems occur in 4.0 ± 1.0 (n=13) men and 3.5 ± 1.0 (n=11) women, $p > 0.05$.

Irritability due to visual impairment is experienced more often by men (31.1 ± 2.5 , n=99) than by women (20.2 ± 2.2 , n=64), $p > 0.05$. Sometimes women experience irritability in communication more often (19.2 ± 2.2 , n=61) than men (6.6 ± 1.3 , n=21), $p < 0.001$ and rarely almost the same answers were received from both men and women (11.3 ± 1.7 , n=36 and 11.6 ± 1.7 , n=37), $p > 0.05$.

Men need outside help more often — 25.8 ± 2.4 (n=82) than women — 10.4 ± 1.7 (n=33), $p < 0.001$. Whereas the majority of women — 24.6 ± 2.4 (n=78) than men — 11.0 ± 1.7 (n=35), $p < 0.001$, noted that they need help and rarely need it 12.2 ± 1.8 (n=39) men and 16.0 ± 2.0 (n=51) women, $p > 0.05$.

Discussion

In ophthalmic diseases, in particular open-angle glaucoma, the quality of life of patients is of great importance [11]. The physical state of men's health is lower than that of women, and the vision of both eyes is higher in men than in women. It should be noted that the general assessment of vision in glaucoma causes a marked decrease in visual function, both in men and women.

According to many authors, glaucoma patients have a reduced quality of life, not only when performing certain skills in everyday life, but also in the industrial sphere [12, 15, 16, 20, 21]. This is confirmed by our results. Thus, in most patients with glaucoma, there is a decrease in efficiency and work restriction, irritability occurs especially in men, and in women uncomfortable relationships due to eye pain and vision problems do less homework. The general assessment of vision in the disease causes a violation of visual perception, and, in this regard, the social and psychological components affecting the quality of life are disrupted, which affects not only mental, but also physical health.

REFERENCES

1. Blindness and visual impairment. WHO. Geneva, Available at: <https://www.who.int/ru/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment> (in Russian).
2. GBD 2019 Blindness and Vision Impairment Collaborators; Vision Loss Expert Group of the Global Burden of Disease Study. Causes of blindness and vision impairment in 2020 and trends over 30 years, and prevalence of avoidable blindness in relation to VISION 2020: the Right to Sight: an analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021;9(2):e144–e160.
3. National Glaucoma Guideline for Practitioners. Eds E. A. Egorova, V. P. Elicheva. 4th ed., rev. and add. Moscow: GEOTAR-Media; 2019 (in Russian).
4. Avdeev R. V., Aleksandrov A. S., Bakunina N. A., Basinsky A. S., Blum E. A., Brezhnev A. Y., et al. Prediction of disease duration and age of patients with different stages of primary open-angle glaucoma. *National Journal of Glaucoma*. 2014;13(2):60–9 (in Russian).
5. Kuroedov A. V., Movsisyan A. B., Egorov E. A., Elichev V. P., Gorodnichy V. V., Brezhnev A. Yu., et al. Profile of patients with primary open-angle glaucoma in the Russian Federation (preliminary results of a multicenter population-based study). Part 1. *National Journal of Glaucoma*. 2021;20(1):3–15 (in Russian).
6. Malishevskaya T. N., Kosakyan S. M., Egorov D. B., Protopopov L. A., Shatskikh S. V., Nemtsova I. V., et al. Regional Glaucoma Patient Registry. Methodological aspects of construction, possibilities of use in clinical practice. *Russian Ophthalmological Journal*. 2020;13(4):7–35 (in Russian).
7. Isaev A. A., Serdyuk V. N., Ustimenko S. B. Prevalence and epidemiology of primary open-angle glaucoma. *Ophthalmology. Eastern Europe*. 2021;11(3):343–54 (in Russian).
8. Clinical guidelines. Primary open-angle glaucoma. Ministry of Health of Russia 2020. Available at: www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_377520/8efd5f17af55cb35a770f73937590c642437b7eb/ (in Russian).
9. Movsisyan A. B., Kuroedov A. V., Arkharov M. A., Prokhorenko V. V., Chepurinov I. A. Epidemiological analysis of the incidence and prevalence of primary open-angle glaucoma in the Russian Federation. *Clinical Ophthalmology*. 2022;22(1):3–10 (in Russian).
10. Novik A. A. Guidelines for the study of quality of life in medicine. St. Petersburg: CJSC OLMA Media Group, 2007. 320 p. (in Russian).
11. Sakhnov S. N. Quality of life as a criterion for the effectiveness of treatment of patients with glaucoma. *Bulletin of the National Research Institute of Public Health named after N. A. Semashko*. 2018;(2):51–7 (in Russian).
12. Ovechkin I. G., Ovechkin N. I., Pokrovsky D. F., Pavlov A. I., Shakula A. V. Ways to improve the study of the patient's quality of life in ophthalmology — world trends and own experience. *National Journal of Glaucoma*. 2022;21(3):58–63 (in Russian).
13. Dhawan M., Hans T., Sandhu P. S., Midha N. Evaluation of Vision-related Quality of Life in Patients with Glaucoma: A Hospital-based Study. *J. Curr. Glaucoma Pract.* 2019;13(1):9–15.

Здоровье и общество

14. Zhang Q., Zhou W., Song D., Xie Y., Lin H., Liang Y., et al. Vision-related quality of life in patients with glaucoma: the role of illness perceptions. *Health Quality Life Outcomes*. 2022;20:78.
15. Voronina A. E., Kanyukov V. N., Borshchuk E. L. The value of assessing the quality of life in patients with glaucoma. In: Sat Art. XII All-Russian scientific and practical conf. from international school: Fedorov readings. Moscow; 2015. P. 123 (in Russian).
16. Gabdrakhmanova A. F., Kurbanov S. A. Quality of life indicators in patients with different stages of primary open-angle glaucoma. In: Glaucoma: Theories, Trends, Technology 2013: Sat scientific. Art. XI International. Congress. Moscow; 2013. P. 86 (in Russian).
17. Kurbanov S. A., Narbutova R. I. Quality of life of patients with open-angle glaucoma. *Bulletin of BSMU*. 2014;(2):135–9 (in Russian).
18. World Vision Report. Geneva: WHO; 2020. 202 p.
19. Manyakov R. R., Osmanov E. M., Zhabina U. V., Berseneva E. A., Efimov D. V., Garaeva A. S., et al. Analysis of comorbidity in ophthalmic practice based on electronic medical record data. *Problems of Social Hygiene, Health Care and Medical History*. 2020;28(5):909–15 (in Russian).
20. Latif K., Nishida T., Moghimi S., Weinreb R. N. Quality of life in glaucoma. *Clini. Exper. Ophthalmol*. 2023;261:3023–30.
21. Kurbanov S. A., Gabdrakhmanova A. F., Khabibullaev Sh. Sh. Comprehensive assessment of the quality of life of patients with glaucoma when using various methods of treatment. *Acta Biomedica Scientifica*. 2022;7(5-2):153–63 (in Russian).

Поступила 15.05.2024
Принята в печать 10.09.2024