Original Research Article

Psychological Status among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Attending in a Tertiary Level Hospital, Kathmandu

Ramila Maharjan¹, Takma K.C², Krishna Devi Shrestha³

¹Senior Lecturer, Kathmandu Model Hospital School of Nursing, Purbanchal University, Kathmandu, Nepal, ²Professor, Maharajgunj Nursing Campus, Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu ³Lecturer, Maharajgunj Nursing Campus, Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University,

Corresponding Author: Ramila Maharjan

ABSTRACT

Background: Psychological status (Anxiety and depression) in diabetic population have strong negative influence on glycemic control, complications and quality of life. Therefore the aim of the study was to assess the psychological status of patient with type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (DM).

Methods: A descriptive, cross sectional design was adopted to conduct the study among 121 patients with type 2 DM patients, attending in Endocrinology OPD at Tribhuvan University, Teaching Hospital (TUTH) Kathmandu, Nepal. The participants were selected purposively and data was collected through interview method, using semi structured questionnaire, along with Nepali version of standard tools, Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI). Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Science Version 16.

Results: The study findings revealed that the mild, moderate and severe level of anxiety and depressive symptoms were 28.1%, 22.3% 12.4% and 23.1%, 19.0%, 7.4% respectively.. Regarding association with anxiety, age (p=0.046), sex (p=0.003), educational level (p<001), duration of illness (p=0.027) and some aspect of family support were found statistically significant. Whereas educational level (p=0.002) and listening to issues were found association with depressive symptoms.

Conclusions: Based on the current study findings, it can be concluded that mild level of anxiety as well as depression symptoms are high among Diabetic patients which was associated with age, sex, educational level duration of illness, family support, thus awareness programs to prevent severity of anxiety and depression among diabetic patients are suggested considering above mentioned associated factors.

Key words: Anxiety, Beck Anxiety Inventory, Beck Depression Inventory, Depression, Psychological Status, Type 2 Diabetes mellitus

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes is a chronic disease with a considerable impact on the health status and quality of life. Apart from other common co-morbid conditions, depression and anxiety have been found to be more [1] with DM. commonly associated Worldwide, the prevalence of anxiety and depression is higher among persons living with diabetes compared to those without diabetes.^[2] Diabetes mellitus is a growing public health concern in Asia, where more

than 110 million people are living with diabetes, and more than 1.0 million people die annually in the region from the disorder. [3]

The study conducted in Kathmandu showed an estimated prevalence of depression between 40.3% and 54.1%.^[4] The study done in Dhulikhel found an overall prevalence of anxiety 22.7 % and depression was 11.7 %. ^[5] Numerous study findings documented higher risk of depression and anxiety among diabetic

population. Anxiety and depression in turn are proven to have strong negative influence on glycemic control, complications and quality of life in diabetic patients. Major evidence linking DM, depression and anxiety comes from developed countries, and there is scarcity of research in this regard in developing and low-income countries.^[6]

Positive psychological status may sustain long-term coping efforts and protect patients from the negative consequences of prolonged emotional disorders, illness perception and thus facilitating diabetes self-management behaviors and better physical health. Negative psychological state can intensify a variety of health threats. ^[7] Coexistence of mental health problems on diabetes mellitus can result in poor management of the illness, poor adherence to treatment, low psychological status and [8] quality of life. low Therefore. measurement of Psychological aspect is very essential. There is limited study regarding psychological status in diabetic patients in Nepal. Hence, the researcher was interested in this topic and this study might fulfill by identifying the gap the psychological status of patient with DM and helps to improve their psychological well being and ultimately better management of diabetes.

METHODS

A descriptive cross sectional design was used to carry out the study. Non probability purposive sampling technique was adopted to collect the data from 121 respondents from July 2017 to August 2017 in medical O.P.D. of TUTH, Maharajgunj. Data was collected through semi structured questionnaire, along with Nepali version of Beck Depression Inventory and Beck Anxiety Inventory. Approval was obtained from research committee of Maharajgunj Nursing Campus, obtained the ethical approval from Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University. The permission was obtained from the hospital authority of the Tribuvan University Teaching Hospital, Maharajgunj. Prior to data collection, informed consent was taken from each respondent. After collecting data, it was checked for completeness of information. Data was then edited, coded, entered into in SPSS version 16. Upon completion of data entry, it was analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistics.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

After collecting data, data were checked for completeness of information. Data were then edited, coded, entered into in SPSS version 16 on the same day. Upon completion of data entry, the data were analyzed by using SPSS version 16. The collected data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics for demographic characteristics. Inferential statistics was used to examine the associations between independent and dependent variables.

RESULTS

(52.9%) More half than of respondents were within the age group of 41- 60 years and only 7.4% were in the less than 40 years with the mean standard deviation of 57.97±1.076 (Table 1). Female constitute more than half (59.5%) of the respondents. In the terms of ethnicity, more than one - fourth (38%) of the respondents cast group. Regarding were upper educational status more than half (59.5%) could read, write, and 52.8% of them have completed up to primary level. Regarding occupation 41.3% of the respondents were homemaker. More than half of respondent's (53.7%) household income was sufficient for 6 - 12 months. Regarding marital status almost all of the respondents (98.3%) were married and majority of the respondents (57.9) were from joint family (Table1).

Age groups (years) - ≤ 40 9 7.4 41-60 64 52.9 ≥ 61 48 39.7 Mean±SD : 57.97±10.076, (Age range 31-78) Sex Female 72 59.5 Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity - - Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status - - Can read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) - - Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation - - Hormemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25<	Characteristics	Number	Percentage
≤ 40 9 7.4 41- 60 64 52.9 ≥ 61 48 39.7 Mean±SD : 57.97±10.076, (Age range 31-78) 59.5 Sex 72 59.5 Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity 9 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status	Age groups (years)		
41- 60 64 52.9 ≥ 61 48 39.7 Mean±SD : 57.97±10.076, (Age range 31- 78) 58 Female 72 59.5 Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status Can read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72)	\leq 40	9	7.4
≥ 61 48 39.7 Mean±SD : 57.97±10.076, (Age range 31-78) Sex Female 72 59.5 Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status	41-60	64	52.9
Mean±SD : 57.97±10.076, (Age range 31-78) Sex $-$ Female 72 59.5 Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity $-$ Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status $-$ Can read and write 72 59.5 Canot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) $-$ Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation $ -$ Homemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status $ -$ Income enough for <6 months	≥ 61	48	39.7
Sex – Female 72 59.5 Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity – – Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status – – Can read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) – – Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation – – Homemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status – – Income enough for <6 months	Mean±SD : 57.97±10.076, (Age range	31-78)	
Female 72 59.5 Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity	Sex		
Male 49 40.5 Ethnicity $-$ Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status $ -$ Can read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) $ -$ Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation $ -$ Homemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status $ -$ Income enough for <6 months	Female	72	59.5
Ethnicity 46 Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) 15 20.8 Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.4 Occupation 19 26.4 Mememaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status 10 8.3 Income enough for < 6 months	Male	49	40.5
Upper caste group 46 38.0 Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status $$	Ethnicity		
Relatively advantaged janajatis 32 26.4 Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status	Upper caste group	46	38.0
Disadvantaged Janjati 23 19.0 Others* 20 16.5 Educational status	Relatively advantaged janajatis	32	26.4
Others* 20 16.5 Educational status $-$ Can read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) $-$ Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation - - Homemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status - - Income enough for <6 months	Disadvantaged Janjati	23	19.0
Educational status 72 59.5 Can read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) 72 59.5 Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation 725.6 41.3 Business 25.6 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status 72.4 72.4 Income enough for < 6 months	Others*	20	16.5
Can read and write 72 59.5 Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72)	Educational status		
Cannot read and write 49 40.5 Level of Education (n = 72) 1 Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation 1 10 8.3 Homemaker 50 41.3 3 Service 31 25.6 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 12 Economic Status 10 8.3 1 Income enough for < 6 months	Can read and write	72	59.5
Level of Education (n = 72) Image: space sp	Cannot read and write	49	40.5
Up to primary level 38 52.8 Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation Homemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status Income enough for < 6 months	Level of Education $(n = 72)$		
Secondary level 15 20.8 Higher Secondary and above level 19 26.4 Occupation	Up to primary level	38	52.8
Higher Secondary and above level1926.4Occupation \cdot Homemaker5041.3Service3125.6Business2520.7Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour)1512.4Economic Status \cdot Income enough for < 6 months	Secondary level	15	20.8
Occupation 50 41.3 Homemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status	Higher Secondary and above level	19	26.4
Homemaker 50 41.3 Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status	Occupation		
Service 31 25.6 Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status 10 8.3 Income enough for < 6 months	Homemaker	50	41.3
Business 25 20.7 Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status I I.2.4 Income enough for < 6 months	Service	31	25.6
Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour) 15 12.4 Economic Status I Income enough for < 6 months	Business	25	20.7
Economic Status 10 8.3 Income enough for < 6 months	Others (Student, Agriculture, Labour)	15	12.4
Income enough for < 6 months 10 8.3 Income enough for 6-12 months 65 53.7 Income enough for 12 months and surplus 46 38.0 Marital Status	Economic Status		
Income enough for 6-12 months6553.7Income enough for 12 months and surplus4638.0Marital Status46Married and living with spouse9578.5Widowed129.9Divorced86.6Separated43.3Unmarried21.7Family Type1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Income enough for < 6 months	10	8.3
Income enough for 12 months and surplus4638.0Marital StatusMarried and living with spouse9578.5Widowed129.9Divorced86.6Separated43.3Unmarried21.7Family TypeJoint7057.9Nuclear5142.1	Income enough for 6-12 months	65	53.7
surplusImage: surplusMartial StatusImage: surplusMarried and living with spouse9578.5Widowed129.9Divorced86.6Separated43.3Unmarried21.7Family TypeImage: surplusJoint7057.9Nuclear5142.1	Income enough for 12 months and	46	38.0
Marital Status 95 78.5 Married and living with spouse 95 78.5 Widowed 12 9.9 Divorced 8 6.6 Separated 4 3.3 Unmarried 2 1.7 Family Type 10 10 Joint 70 57.9 Nuclear 51 42.1	surplus		
Married and living with spouse 95 78.5 Widowed 12 9.9 Divorced 8 6.6 Separated 4 3.3 Unmarried 2 1.7 Family Type	Marital Status		
Widowed 12 9.9 Divorced 8 6.6 Separated 4 3.3 Unmarried 2 1.7 Family Type	Married and living with spouse	95	78.5
Divorced 8 6.6 Separated 4 3.3 Unmarried 2 1.7 Family Type Image: Comparison of the symptotic symptot symptot symptot symptotic symptot symptot symptot symptot sympto	Widowed	12	9.9
Separated 4 3.3 Unmarried 2 1.7 Family Type Image: Comparison of the system of the syste	Divorced	8	6.6
Unmarried 2 1.7 Family Type	Separated	4	3.3
Family Type 70 57.9 Joint 70 57.9 Nuclear 51 42.1	Unmarried	2	1.7
Joint 70 57.9 Nuclear 51 42.1	Family Type		
Nuclear 51 42.1	Joint	70	57.9
	Nuclear	51	42.1

1	Table 1: Socio-demographic	Characte	eristics of t	he Res	<u>pondent</u>

Anxiety symptom was present in more than half of respondents (62.8%) and depressive symptom was present nearly half of the respondents (49.6%). Among those with anxiety symptoms, majority of respondents (28.1%) had mild levels of anxiety symptoms as well as majority of respondent (23.1%) had mild level of depressive symptoms. Sever level of symptoms were lowest in both anxiety and depression that were (12.4%) and (7.4%) respectively (Table 2).

Table	2:	Anxiety	and	Depressive	Symptoms	and	its	level
among	; the	Respond	lents					

Variables	Number	Percentage	Confidence Interval					
Anxiety related Symptom								
Present	76	62.8						
Level of Anxiety Syn	ıptom							
Normal (0-9)	45	37.2	(28.1-46.3)					
Mild (10-18)	34	28.1	(19.9-36.4)					
Moderate (19-29)	27	22.3	(14.9-29.8)					
Severe (30-63)	15	12.4	(6.6-18.2)					
Depressive related Sy	ymptom							
Present	60	49.6						
Level of Depressive S	Symptom							
Normal (0-9)	61	50.4	(41.3-58.7)					
Mild (10-16)	28	23.1	(15.7-30.6)					
Moderate (17-29)	23	19.0	(12.4-25.6)					
Severe (30-63)	9	7.4	(3.3-12.4)					

* - Others include Dalit, Disadvantaged non - dalit Terai caste group, Religious minorities which include less number in each

group.	
Table	3

|--|

Characteristics	Anxiety Symp	ptoms	χ^2 value	p value
	Present (%)	Absent (%)		
Age Groups (in years)				
\leq 50	16 (48.5)	17(51.5)	3.98	0.046
≥ 51	60 (68.2)	28 (31.8)		
Sex				
Female	53 (73.6)	19(26.4)	8.88	0.003
Male	23 (46.9)	26 (53.1)		
Occupation				
Home maker	37 (74.0)	13(26.0)	4.82	0.185
Service	17 (54.8)	14 (45.2)		
Business	13(52.0)	12 (48.0)		
Others	9 (60)	6 (40.0)		
Economic Status				
Income enough for < 1 year	49 (65.3)	26(34.7)	0.53	0.463
Income enough for > 1 year	27 (58.7)	19 (41.3)		
Education Status				
Can read and write	41 (56.9)	31 (43.1)	2.61	0.106
Cannot read and write	35 (71.4)	14 (28.6)		
Level of Education (72)				
Up to primary school completed	30 (78.9)	8 (21.1)	15.89	<0.001
Above primary school completed	11 (32.4)	23 (67.6)		
Duration of Illness (in years)				
≤ 10	48 (56.5)	37 (43.5)	4.91	0.027
≥11	28(77.8)	8 (22.2)		
Types of Treatment				
Oral Tablets	60 (62.5)	36 (37.5)	0.01	0.921
Injecting Insulin	14 (63.6)	8 (36.4)		
p-	 significant at < 	0.05		

It was observed that age (p=0.046) and sex (p=0.003) had significant association with anxiety symptom. And there was highly significant association between educational levels (p<001). Anxiety symptoms were found more in those respondents who suffered for long duration that was > 10 years (77.8%) and was found significant association (p=0.027) (Table3).

Regarding family support, listening to issues of family support had significant association (p=0.044) with anxiety symptoms (table 4).

Variables	Anxiety Symptoms		χ^2 value	p value
	Present n (%)	Absent n (%)		
Economic support				
Always	51 (58.6)	36 (41.4)	2.45	0.293
Sometime	12 (70.6)	5 (29.4)		
Never	13 (76.5)	4 (23.5)		
Support in follow up	visit			
Always	43 (57.3)	32 (42.7)	2.86	0.239
Sometime	21 (75.0)	7(25.0)		
Never	12(66.7)	6(33.3)		
Listening issues				
Always	44 (55.0)	36 (45.0)	6.26	0.044
Sometime	23 (76.7)	7 (23.3)		
Never	9 (81.8)	2 (18.2)		

 Table 4: Association between Anxiety Symptoms with different aspect of Family Support of the Respondents
 n=121

It shows that educational level (p < 0.002) had significant association with depressive symptoms and others variables shows insignificant association (table 5).

 Table 5: Association between Depressive Symptoms and Socio-demographic Characteristics, duration of illness and types of treatment of the Respondents
 n=121

Characteristics	Depressive Symptoms		χ^2 value	p value
	Present	Absent		
	n (%)	n (%)		
Age Groups (in years)				
\leq 50	12 (36.4)	21(63.6)	3.17	0.075
≥ 51	48 (54.5)	40 (45.5)		
Sex				
Female	40 (55.6)	32 (44.4)	2.53	0.111
Male	20 (40.8)	29 (59.2)		
Occupation				
Home maker	27 (54.0)	23 (46.0)	1.30	0.728
Service	16 (51.6)	11 (57.9)		
Business	11 (44.0)	14 (56.0)		
Others	6 (40)	9 (60)		
Economic Status				
Income enough for < 1 year	42 (56.0)	33 (44.0)	3.24	0.072
Income enough for > 1 year	18 (39.1)	28 (60.9)		
Education Status				
Can read and write	31 (43.1)	41 (56.9)		
Cannot read and write	29 (59.2)	20 (40.8)	3.03	0.082
Education Level				
Up to primary level	23 (60.5)	15 (39.5)	10.02	0.002
Above primary level	8 (23.5)	26 (76.5)		
Duration of Illness (in years)				
≤ 10	39 (45.9)	46 (54.1)	1.56	0.210
≥11	21(58.3)	15 (41.7)		
Type of Treatment				
Oral Tablets	47 (47.5)	52 (52.5)	0.97	0.324
Injecting Insulin	13 (59.1)	9 (40.9)		
p- si	gnificant at <	0.05		

Regarding family support, it was observed that only available to listen issues about diabetes care had significant associations (p=0.007) with depressive symptoms and other variables shows insignificant association (table 6).

Family Support variables	Depressive Symptoms		χ^2 value	<i>p</i> value
	Present	Absent		
	n (%)	n (%)		
Economic support				
Always	40 (46.0)	47 (54.0)	3.49	0.174
Sometime	8 (47.1)	9 (52.9)		
Never	12 (70.6)	5 (29.4)		
Support in follow visit				
Always	34 (45.3)	41 (54.7)	1.68	0.432
Sometime	15 (53.6)	13 (46.4)		
Never	11 (61.1)	7 (38.9)		
Listening to issues				
Always	32 (40.0)	48 (60.0)	8.79	0.012
Sometime	20 (66.7)	10 (33.3)		
Never	8 (72.7)	3 (27.3)		

 Table 6: Association between Depressive Symptoms with different aspect of Family Support of the Respondents. n=121

p- significant at < 0.05

DISCUSSION

The overall presence of anxiety symptoms was 62.8% and among them, 28.1% had mild, 22.3% moderate and only 12.4% had severe level of anxiety. Similarly the presence of depression was 49.6% and among them 23.1% had mild, 19.0% had moderate and only 7.4% had severe level of depression. This rate was supported with this higher score ranges from 40-69.6%. [6,9,10,12] Regarding the severity of anxiety symptoms the prevalence of mild to severe anxiety score was 42.4% which was similar with this present study. ^[11] Similarly the presence of depression was comparable to different previous study ranged from 40% to 60%. ^[11–13]

In this study the findings show statistical significance (p= 0.046) between anxiety symptoms and age of the respondents. Anxiety was more common in age group of 51 and above. This finding was comparable (p < 0.001) to the descriptive study done in Malaysia Saudi Arabia.^[14, 15] The higher risk of anxiety and depression among females than in males is well recognized, even in the general population. Also in this study, the result revealed that anxiety symptoms was significantly more common (p=0.003) in female than in males. This finding was supported (p=0.000) by a descriptive cross - sectional study done in Saudi Arabia and Iran. ^[15, 16] Higher anxiety and depressive symptoms were associated (<0.001), (0.002) with lower educational attainment. This result was supported in both anxiety and depression (p<0.05) in

survev study done in Lithuania, a descriptive cross-sectional study done in Malaysia and Saudi Arabia. [10, 14, 15] The current study shows that there was significant (p=0.027) association between anxiety and duration of diabetes. Anxiety was high in those who suffered from > 10years duration. This finding was supported [10,15] There were also i.e. p<0.001. significant association seen in family support in listening to issues about diabetic care (p=0.044) in anxiety and (p=0.012) in depression. This study was match with the previous studies which showed non supportive behaviors were associated with depression and anxiety.^[16]

CONCLUSION

Based on the study findings it can be concluded that most of the respondents have mild level of anxiety as well as depressive symptoms. Anxiety is more common in later adulthood and female with long duration of Similarly both anxiety illness. and depression are significantly associated with low educational level and unavailability support from family in emotional aspect i.e. listening issues about diabetes care. To conclude, although the mild level of anxiety and depression are high, there should be raised awareness to delay the severity and other complications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher would like to express heartfelt thanks to Maharajgunj Nursing Campus and also University Grants Commission

under the Faculty Research Grant 2072/73 to conduct this study

REFERENCES

- Saleh F, Ara F, Mumu SJ, Hafez MA. Assessment of health-related quality of life of Bangladeshi patients with type 2 diabetes using the EQ-5D: A crosssectional study. BMC Research Notes. 2015; 8(1): 497. doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1453-9.
- Lin EH, Rutter CM, Katon W, Heckbert SR, Ciechanowski P, Oliver MM, et al. Depression and advanced complications of diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2010; 33(2): 264-269. doi.org/10.2337/dc09-1068.
- Chan JC, Malik V, Jia W, Kadowaki T, Yajnik CS, Yoon KH, et al. Diabetes in Asia: Epidemiology, risk factors, and pathophysiology. The Journal of the American Medical Association. 2009; 301(20): 2129-2140. doi:10.1001/jama.2009.726
- Niraula K, Kohrt BA, Flora MS, Thapa N, Mumu SJ, Pathak R, et al. Prevalence of Depression and Associated Risk Factors among Persons with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus without a Prior Psychiatric History: A Cross-Sectional Study in Clinical Settings in Urban Nepal. BMC Psychiatry. 2013; 13(1): 309. doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-13-309
- Risal A, Manandhar K, Linde M, SteinerTJ, Holen A. (2016). Anxiety and depression in Nepal: Prevalence, comorbidity and associations. BMC Psychiatry. 2016; 16(1): 102. doi.org/10.1186/s12888-016-0810-0
- 6. Kodakandla K, Maddela G, Pasha MS, Vallepalli R. A cross sectional study on influencing prevalence and factors anxiety and depression among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. 2017; 4(7): 2542-2547. doi.org/10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20161890
- Chew BH, Shariff-Ghazali S, Fernandez A. Psychological aspects of diabetes care: Effecting behavioral change in

patients. World Journal of Diabetes. 2014; 5(6):796-808. doi:10.4239/wjd.v5.i6.796.

- Mossie TB, Berhe GH, Kahsay GH, Tareke M. Prevalence of Depression and Associated Factors among Diabetic Patients at Mekelle City, North Ethiopia. Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine. 2017; 39(1):52-58. doi:10.4103/0253-7176.198947.
- Khuwaja AK, Lalani S, Dhanani R, Azam IS, Rafique G, White F. Anxiety and depression among outpatients with type 2 diabetes: A multi-centre study of prevalence and associated factors. Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome. 2010; 2(1): 72. doi.org/10.1186/1758-5996-2-72
- Mikaliukstiene A, Žagminas K, Juozulynas A, Narkauskaite L, Salyga J, Jankauskiene K, Stukas R, Šurkiene G. Prevalence and determinants of anxiety and depression symptoms in patients with type 2 diabetes in Lithuania. Medical science monitor: international medical journal of experimental and clinical research. 2014;20:182-190. doi:10.12659/MSM.890019.
- 11. Mishra SR, Sharma A, Bhandari PM, Bhochhibhoya S, Thapa K. Depression and Health-Related Quality of Life among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Cross-Sectional Study in Nepal. PLOS ONE. 2015; 10(11): e0141385.

doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141385

- 12. Sun N, Lou P, Shang Y, et al. Prevalence and determinants of depressive and anxiety symptoms in adults with type 2 diabetes in China: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2016; 6:e012540. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012540
- 13. Khullar S, Dhillon H, Kaur G, Sharma R, Mehta K, Aggarwal R, et al. The prevalence and predictors of depression in type 2 diabetic population of Punjab. Community mental health journal. 2016; 52(4): 479. Available from: from

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007 /s10597-015-9985-y

- 14. Ganasegeran K., Renganathan P, Manaf RA, Al-Dubai S AR. Factors associated with anxiety and depression among type 2 diabetes outpatients in Malaysia: A descriptive cross-sectional single-centre study. British Medical Journal Open, 2014; 4(4): e004794. doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-004794
- 15. Al-Mohaimeed AA. Prevalence and factors associated with anxiety and depression among type 2 diabetes in

Qassim, KSA: A descriptive crosssectional study.Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences. 2017. doi.org/10.1016/j.jtumed.2017.04.002

16. Garrusi B, Baneshi MR, Moradi S. (2013). Psychosocial contributing factors that affect mental well being in diabetic patients. Russian Open Medical Journal. 2013; 2(1). Available from: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/psychos ocial-contributing-factors-that-affectmental-well-being-in-diabetic-patients

How to cite this article: Maharjan R, Takma KC, Shrestha KD. Psychological status among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus attending in a tertiary level hospital, Kathmandu. Int J Health Sci Res. 2019; 9(4):142-148.
