

THE INTERNATIONAL INDEX OF ERECTILE FUNCTION (IIEF): A MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALE FOR ASSESSMENT OF ERECTILE DYSFUNCTION

RAYMOND C. ROSEN, ALAN RILEY, GORM WAGNER, IAN H. OSTERLOH, JOHN KIRKPATRICK,
AND AVANISH MISHRA

ABSTRACT

Objectives. To develop a brief, reliable, self-administered measure of erectile function that is cross-culturally valid and psychometrically sound, with the sensitivity and specificity for detecting treatment-related changes in patients with erectile dysfunction.

Methods. Relevant domains of sexual function across various cultures were identified via a literature search of existing questionnaires and interviews of male patients with erectile dysfunction and of their partners. An initial questionnaire was administered to patients with erectile dysfunction, with results reviewed by an international panel of experts. Following linguistic validation in 10 languages, the final 15-item questionnaire, the International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF), was examined for sensitivity, specificity, reliability (internal consistency and test-retest repeatability), and construct (concurrent, convergent, and discriminant) validity.

Results. A principal components analysis identified five factors (that is, erectile function, orgasmic function, sexual desire, intercourse satisfaction, and overall satisfaction) with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. A high degree of internal consistency was observed for each of the five domains and for the total scale (Cronbach's alpha values of 0.73 and higher and 0.91 and higher, respectively) in the populations studied. Test-retest repeatability correlation coefficients for the five domain scores were highly significant. The IIEF demonstrated adequate construct validity, and all five domains showed a high degree of sensitivity and specificity to the effects of treatment. Significant (P values = 0.0001) changes between baseline and post-treatment scores were observed across all five domains in the treatment responder cohort, but not in the treatment nonresponder cohort.

Conclusions. The IIEF addresses the relevant domains of male sexual function (that is, erectile function, orgasmic function, sexual desire, intercourse satisfaction, and overall satisfaction), is psychometrically sound, and has been linguistically validated in 10 languages. This questionnaire is readily self-administered in research or clinical settings. The IIEF demonstrates the sensitivity and specificity for detecting treatment-related changes in patients with erectile dysfunction. UROLOGY 49: 822-830, 1997. © 1997, Elsevier Science Inc. All rights reserved.

Erectile dysfunction (ED), defined by a National Institutes of Health (NIH) Consensus Development Conference as the inability to achieve or

maintain an erection sufficient for satisfactory sexual performance,¹ is estimated to affect as many as 30 million men in the United States.² The problem is strongly age-related, with an approximately two-fold to threefold increase in the prevalence of moderate-to-severe ED between the ages of 40 and 70 years.² A variety of medical, psychologic, and lifestyle factors have been implicated in the etiology of ED,²⁻⁴ which impacts negatively on self-esteem, quality of life, and interpersonal relationships.¹

Although laboratory-based diagnostic procedures are available, it has been proposed that sexual function is best assessed in a naturalistic setting with patient self-report techniques.^{3,6} For this purpose, multidimensional instruments are more

This research was supported by a grant from Pfizer Inc.

From the Center for Sex and Marital Health, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Piscataway, New Jersey; Human Sexuality Unit, Harewood House, Springfield University Hospital, London, United Kingdom; Department of Medical Physiology, Panum Institute, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark; and Pfizer Central Research, Sandwich, United Kingdom, and Pfizer Central Research, Groton, Connecticut.

Reprint requests: Raymond C. Rosen, Ph.D., Department of Psychiatry, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, 675 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854

Submitted: December 11, 1996, accepted (with revisions): February 24, 1997

sensitive than unidimensional scales in the evaluation of treatment outcomes, and they are more psychometrically valid.⁷ Multidimensional scales also provide greater potential for use in a clinical setting. Self-report methods are preferable to patient interview techniques, particularly in multicenter, multinational clinical trials.

Existing self-report measures of male sexual function⁸⁻¹¹ have several limitations, including excessive length or complexity, unacceptable patient burden, an overly narrow or restrictive focus, and inadequate psychometric, cultural, or linguistic validation. None of the current measures has been demonstrated to have adequate discriminant validity or to provide sufficient sensitivity in evaluating treatment outcomes in multinational clinical trials. Additionally, factor analytic methods were not used in the development of existing measures. Despite these limitations, self-report measures provide essential data on male sexual function in both research and clinical settings.⁵ A strong recommendation of the NIH Consensus Conference was to develop better and more reliable methods for assessing the symptoms of ED and relevant treatment outcomes.¹

The objective of the present research was to develop a brief and reliable measure of erectile function that is culturally, linguistically, and psychometrically valid. State-of-the-art methods for questionnaire development were used, and a multidimensional measure was designed to provide sensitive and specific outcome assessments in clinical trials of ED. Finally, the goal was to develop a self-administered questionnaire that would be suitable for use by clinicians and researchers, one that would be minimally burdensome to patients.

METHODS

PHASE 1: ITEM SELECTION

Using multiple sources, relevant domains of male sexual function were identified across various cultures. A comprehensive review of the literature was conducted, and existing questionnaire instruments were evaluated. Detailed interviews of male patients with ED ($n = 37$) and their partners ($n = 7$) were also conducted in five countries. In this phase, four dimensions of male sexual function were identified: erectile function, orgasmic function, sexual desire, and sexual satisfaction. In a phase II trial of 351 patients with ED, an initial version of the questionnaire was administered and found to have a high degree of internal consistency among items (Cronbach's alpha statistic¹² greater than 0.85) and excellent treatment sensitivity ($P < 0.01$).¹³ An exploratory factor analysis was performed that indicated a robust factor structure.^{13,14} The results were reviewed by an international panel of experts who made recommendations for item modification and the development of additional items.

PHASE 2: CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC EVALUATION

Pilot testing of the instrument was conducted in 14 men with ED in the United Kingdom. All patients completed the

International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF) questionnaire in less than 15 minutes and reported little or no difficulty in comprehending the items. Linguistic validation of the instrument was conducted in 10 languages (Danish, Dutch, English [American, Australian, and British], Finnish, French, German, Italian, Norwegian, Spanish, and Swedish)* in 12 countries by the MAPI Research Institute in Lyon, France. This process included forward and back translations of the items and comprehensive testing of the final item pool. International harmonization techniques were used to ensure cross-cultural equivalence of the items in the targeted languages.

PHASE 3: RELIABILITY, CONSTRUCT VALIDITY, AND TREATMENT RESPONSIVENESS

The final 15-item questionnaire (see Appendix) was administered in a large-scale clinical trial of patients with ED (study A), a comparison group of functional, age-matched volunteers (study B), and a clinical validation study that included both patients with ED and normal volunteers (study C). The designs of the studies and subject characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Each study protocol was approved by the institutional review board at the participating site. All participants in the studies gave written informed consent. Men aged 18 years or older with a clinical diagnosis of ED of broad-spectrum etiology and of at least 6 months' duration (studies A and C) or normal volunteers (studies B and C) were eligible for enrollment. Patients with penile anatomic defects, uncontrolled major medical illnesses or psychologic disorders, or known drug or alcohol dependence were excluded from the studies.

Study A. This study consisted of a 2 to 4-week run-in phase, followed by a 12-week, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase in which 111 patients with ED of broad-spectrum etiology were randomized to receive either placebo or 25 mg (one capsule) of sildenafil (VIAGRA; Pfizer Inc.). Sildenafil is an oral medication that is being evaluated for the treatment of ED.^{15,16} The placebo or sildenafil dose could be increased to 50 mg (two capsules) and then to 100 mg (four capsules) if a patient's response was suboptimal. The IIEF was self-administered at the screening visit (week -4 or -2), at the end of the run-in phase (week 0), and at the end of 2, 4, 8, and 12 weeks of double-blind treatment. A global efficacy question ("Did the treatment improve your erections?") was asked at the end of the double-blind treatment phase. The sensitivity, specificity, and reliability (internal consistency and test-retest repeatability) of the 15-item questionnaire were determined as follows. Each patient was designated as a "responder" or "nonresponder," based on his response to the end-of-treatment global efficacy question. Within each cohort, the mean and median baseline-to-end point changes in response values for each question were calculated. The sensitivity of the IIEF was assessed by evaluating the clinical relevance and statistical significance of the changes in the responder cohort. Specificity was assessed in the same manner in the nonresponder cohort. Internal consistency was evaluated by calculating Cronbach's alpha statistic on the item domains and the total scale.¹²

Study B. This study assessed the response to the IIEF questionnaire in 109 male volunteers (controls) without any history of male ED. These volunteers were age-matched to the patients randomized in study A (Table 1). The IIEF was self-administered, with the results in these controls compared with those obtained in men with ED in study A using be-

* Additional validation studies of other languages (for example, Arabic, Chinese, Mandarin, and Portuguese, among others) in Asia and Latin America are ongoing.

TABLE I. Study designs and baseline characteristics of individuals enrolled in validation studies

Study Design	Study A (Patients with ED)	Study B (Controls)	Study C	
			Patients with ED	Controls
Treatments	Sildenafil (25, 50, or 100 mg) or placebo	None	None	
Duration of study	12 weeks	1 day	4 weeks	
Timing of IIEF self-administration	Week -4 or -2, 0, 2, 4, 8, and 12	Day 1	Week 0 and 4	
Other relevant assessments	Global efficacy question: final visit		Clinical interview: Week 0 and 4 Locke-Wallace Scale: Week 0 Marlowe-Crowne Scale: Week 0	
Patient characteristics				
n	111	109	37	21
Mean age, yr (range)	56 (29-89)	55 (29-76)	53 (29-71)	58 (37-76)
Mean duration of ED, yr (range)	4.61 (1-37)	—	5.9 (1-18)	—
Primary etiology*				
Organic	21%	—	14%	—
Psychogenic	40%	—	49%	—
Mixed	37%	—	38%	—
Unknown	3%	—	0%	—

KEY: ED = erectile dysfunction; IIEF = International Index of Erectile Function.

* Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.

tween-groups discriminant analysis (analysis of covariance controlling for age) and post hoc comparison of group differences on individual items.

Study C. This 4-week study evaluated the construct validity and test-retest repeatability of the IIEF in 37 patients with male ED and in 21 age-matched controls (Table I). The IIEF was self-administered at week 0 and week 4. In this study, blinded clinical interviews of patients were conducted at week 0 to evaluate the convergent validity of the measure (that is, concordance with an independent method of assessment). In addition, patients completed measures of marital satisfaction (Locke-Wallace scale¹⁷) and social desirability (Marlowe-Crowne scale¹⁸) to assess divergent validity (that is, separateness from overlapping or related constructs) at week 0. Test-retest reliability of the total and individual item scores of the IIEF were assessed by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient¹⁹ for each group (patients and controls). Internal consistency was evaluated using the Kuder-Richardson formula. Discriminant validity was assessed using repeated-measures analysis of variance, with subject group as the between-groups variable, time (week 0 and week 4) as the repeated-measures factor, and study measure as the outcome variable.

RESULTS

FACTOR ANALYSIS AND DOMAIN SCORING

A principal components analysis (with varimax rotation) was performed to investigate the factor structure of the final 15-item questionnaire (see Appendix). Five factors with eigenvalues⁷ greater than 1.0 were identified (Table II). Final item se-

lection for each factor was based on a combination of statistical and clinical considerations.²⁰ Based on results of the confirmatory factor analysis, together with clinical interviews and expert panel consultation, the responses to individual items of the questionnaire were assigned to five separate domains of sexual function: (1) erectile function, (2) orgasmic function, (3) sexual desire, (4) intercourse satisfaction, and (5) overall satisfaction. Domain scores were computed by summing the scores for individual items in each domain. The system of domain scoring and resulting interdomain correlations are presented in Table III.

SCALE RELIABILITY

Two separate aspects of scale reliability were evaluated, namely, internal consistency and test-retest repeatability. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was computed separately for the five domains and for all items combined in each of the three test samples. Responses in the erectile and orgasmic function domains were highly consistent, with alpha values greater than 0.90 (Table IV). A satisfactory degree of consistency also was observed for items in the other domains (alpha values greater than 0.70) and for the total scale (alpha values greater than 0.90) in each of the test samples.

Test-retest repeatability was assessed in study C by computing correlations between the domain scores and total scale scores at baseline and week

⁷ Eigenvalue is a statistical measure of the relative explanatory power of individual factors in a factor analysis.

TABLE II. Principal components analysis with varimax rotation of 15 questions of International Index of Erectile Function: factor loadings*

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1. Erection frequency	0.77	0.03	0.31	0.17	-0.05
2. Erection firmness	0.92	0.12	0.20	0.08	0.04
3. Penetration ability	0.89	0.16	0.15	0.06	0.14
4. Maintenance frequency	0.82	0.26	0.13	-0.02	0.22
5. Maintenance ability	0.68	0.39	0.09	0.07	0.41
6. Intercourse frequency	0.10	-0.02	0.11	0.34	0.79
7. Intercourse satisfaction	0.61	0.28	0.31	-0.13	0.48
8. Intercourse enjoyment	0.53	0.39	0.18	0.01	0.53
9. Ejaculation frequency	0.26	0.20	0.89	0.10	0.13
10. Orgasm frequency	0.23	0.25	0.87	0.18	0.12
11. Desire frequency	0.06	-0.01	0.15	0.88	0.16
12. Desire level	0.04	0.26	0.07	0.87	0.08
13. Overall satisfaction	0.29	0.76	0.28	0.15	-0.01
14. Relationship satisfaction	0.18	0.83	0.21	0.14	0.13
15. Erection confidence	0.65	0.53	0.01	0.01	0.07
Eigenvalue	4.72	2.22	2.03	1.81	1.47

* Items with the highest loadings within each factor are boldfaced.

4 visits. As shown in Table IV, test-retest repeatability was relatively high for the erectile function ($r = 0.84$) and intercourse satisfaction ($r = 0.81$) domains, as well as for the total scale scores ($r = 0.82$). Moderately high correlations were observed for the other domains (r values of 0.64 to 0.77).

DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY

Discriminant validity, or the ability of the IIEF scale to discriminate reliably between clinical and nonclinical populations, was assessed by comparing the responses from patients with ED with those from controls in two studies. As shown in Table V, highly significant differences were observed between the the patients with ED and age-matched controls for most domains. Differences between domain scores between these two groups were greatest for the erectile function domain ($P \leq 0.0001$), followed by intercourse satisfaction ($P \leq 0.001$) and overall satisfaction ($P \leq 0.001$). The least degree of difference between patients and controls was seen for the sexual desire domain, with results failing to reach statistical significance in study C. This result is not surprising because all patients were recruited for a clinical trial of ED and were excluded for concomitant sexual disorders, such as hypoactive sexual desire.

CONVERGENT AND DIVERGENT VALIDITY

To demonstrate construct validity of a new measure, it is important to show that scale scores are positively correlated with independent measures of the same or similar domains (convergent validity). Conversely, there should be minimal association with measures that do not directly assess the

domains in question (divergent validity). In study C, domain scores were compared with blinded, independent clinician ratings of sexual functioning and with scales that measure marital adjustment (Locke-Wallace) and social desirability (Marlowe-Crowne). Significant positive correlations were observed between independent clinician ratings and subscale scores for all five domains (Table VI). In contrast, none of the correlations between domain scores and measures of marital adjustment or social desirability reached statistical significance.

SENSITIVITY AND SPECIFICITY

To evaluate the sensitivity of the IIEF, a comparison was made between mean pretreatment and post-treatment domain scores of patients who were self-rated as treatment responders in study A. Specificity was assessed by comparing the pretreatment and post-treatment domain scores in patients rated as nonresponders in the same study. Patients were defined as responders or nonresponders based on their response to the end-of-treatment global efficacy question. All five domains of the IIEF demonstrated a high degree of sensitivity and specificity to the effects of treatment (Table VII). Although the magnitude of change was greatest for the erectile function domain, significant changes were observed across all five domains in the treatment responder group. The lowest magnitude of change was noted for the sexual desire domain. In contrast, none of the comparisons in the treatment nonresponder group approached significance (P values of 0.11 to 0.79).

TABLE III. IIEF domain scoring and intercorrelations

Domain	Items	Domain Scoring		
		Score Range	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
EF	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15	0 (or 1)-5	1	30
OF	9, 10	0-5	0	10
SD	11, 12	1-5	2	10
IS	6, 7, 8	0-5	0	15
OS	13, 14	1-5	2	10

	Domain Intercorrelations				
	EF	OF	SD	IS	OS
EF	1.00				
OF	0.55	1.00			
SD	0.30	0.39	1.00		
IS	0.76	0.47	0.35	1.00	
OS	0.60	0.53	0.37	0.53	1.00

Key: EF = erectile function; IIEF = International Index of Erectile Function; IS = intercourse satisfaction; OF = orgasmic function; OS = overall satisfaction; SD = sexual desire.

COMMENT

A 15-item, self-administered questionnaire scale was developed for the assessment of erectile function. This instrument (the IIEF) was developed in several stages, including initial pretesting with selected patient groups and expert panel consultants, followed by an intensive linguistic validation process. Based on a principal components analysis with varimax rotation, five factors or response domains were identified: (1) erectile function, (2) orgasmic function, (3) sexual desire, (4) intercourse satisfaction, and (5) overall satisfaction. The highest degree of positive correlation was between erectile function and intercourse satisfaction ($r = 0.76$), with two items (items 7 and 8) showing positive loadings on both factors. This is not surprising because a primary outcome of ED for most patients is the inability to achieve satisfactory sexual intercourse.¹

Psychometric validation of the final instrument was addressed in three major areas: (1) test reliability, (2) construct validity, and (3) treatment responsiveness. Adequate performance in each of these areas should be demonstrated before a new scale is accepted for general research or clinical use.²¹⁻²³ For the IIEF, analyses were performed in each of these areas in two separate samples of patients with ED and age-matched controls. Overall, the IIEF was shown to have strong internal consistency, measured in terms of both the total scale and individual domain scores, and adequate test-retest repeatability. Although some variation in the degree of internal consistency was noted between samples, all of the values obtained were greater than 0.70 and more than half were greater than

0.90. Test-retest repeatability correlation coefficients ranged from 0.64 to 0.84, and all were highly significant.

Construct validity (that is, whether the instrument actually measures what it was designed to assess) is normally accomplished by experimental testing of a priori questions or hypotheses, such as: (1) Will the test reliably differentiate between clinical patients and age-matched controls? (discriminant validity); (2) Can a positive association be shown with alternative measures of the same construct or domains? (convergent validity); and (3) Are the results influenced by related, but conceptually independent, variables? (divergent validity). In the present study, adequate construct validity was established in each of these three areas. Discriminant validity was demonstrated by a comparison of baseline scores between patients and controls. In the larger sample (studies A and B), between-group differences were highly significant (P values ≤ 0.01) for all five domains. In the smaller sample (study C), differences between groups were significant (P values ≤ 0.01) for all domains, with the exception of sexual desire ($P = 0.72$). In this study, patients and controls were closely matched on sexual desire, perhaps reflecting a high level of sexual motivation in patients seeking treatment in a clinical trial of ED. Tests of convergent and divergent validity were similarly confirmatory. First, a significant positive association was shown with independent clinician ratings for each of the major response domains. As expected, the highest correlation was observed for the domain of erectile function ($r = 0.75$). This association might have been even higher, except for the fact that clinician interview ratings took

TABLE IV. IIEF domain characteristics: reliability

	Internal Consistency*			Test-Retest Repeatability [†]
	Study A	Study B	Study C	Study C
All items	0.91	0.96	0.91	0.82
Erectile function	0.92	0.96	0.93	0.84
Orgasmic function	0.92	0.99	0.93	0.64
Sexual desire	0.77	0.82	0.91	0.71
Intercourse satisfaction	0.73	0.87	0.88	0.81
Overall satisfaction	0.74	0.87	0.86	0.77

KEY: IIEF = International Index of Erectile Function.
 * Cronbach's alpha.
[†] Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

TABLE V. IIEF domain characteristics: discriminant validity

Domain	Study A and Study B			Study C		
	Patients	Controls	P Value*	Patients	Controls	P Value*
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD		Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	
Erectile function	10.7 ± 6.5	25.8 ± 7.6	≤0.0001	13.5 ± 8.1	26.9 ± 5.3	≤0.0001
Orgasmic function	5.3 ± 3.2	8.8 ± 2.9	≤0.001	7.3 ± 3.5	9.5 ± 2.2	≤0.01
Sexual desire	6.3 ± 1.9	7.0 ± 1.8	≤0.01	7.2 ± 1.5	7.0 ± 1.9	0.72
Intercourse satisfaction	5.5 ± 3.0	10.6 ± 3.9	≤0.001	6.0 ± 4.5	10.8 ± 4.8	≤0.0003
Overall satisfaction	4.4 ± 2.3	8.6 ± 1.7	≤0.001	5.5 ± 2.4	9.0 ± 1.6	≤0.0001

KEY: IIEF = International Index of Erectile Function.
 * P values assessed using repeat-measures, between-groups analysis of variance method.

TABLE VI. IIEF domain characteristics: convergent and divergent validity

Domain	Validation Measure (Study C)					
	Clinical Interview		Marital Adjustment (Locke-Wallace)		Social Desirability (Marlowe-Crowne)	
	Pearson r	P Value	Pearson r	P Value	Pearson r	P Value
Erectile function	0.75	<0.0001	-0.08	0.62	-0.07	0.63
Orgasmic function	0.51	<0.001	-0.21	0.23	-0.13	0.45
Sexual desire	0.61	<0.0001	0.16	0.36	0.24	0.15
Intercourse satisfaction	0.45	<0.005	-0.05	0.89	-0.02	0.78
Overall satisfaction	0.63	<0.001	0.31	0.07	0.17	0.31

KEY: IIEF = International Index of Erectile Function.

into account both past history and current sexual performance ratings, whereas the questionnaire assessed only the latter. Second, measures of social desirability and marital adjustment were not significantly correlated with any IIEF domain scores. This suggests that IIEF scores are highly independent of social desirability and marital adjustment influences.

A final area of test validation concerns treatment responsiveness, or the sensitivity and specificity of the instrument, which was evaluated by comparing the change between baseline and end point scores in treatment responders and nonresponders (study A). A high degree of sensitivity and speci-

ficity was demonstrated for each of the domains of the IIEF. For the responder group, highly significant changes between baseline and end point scores were observed in each domain. The mean change in scores was highest for the erectile function domain and lowest for the sexual desire domain. These results are not surprising because the study drug, sildenafil, is an agent with a peripheral site of action and proerectile effects.^{15,16} Treatment response specificity was demonstrated by the relative lack of change between baseline and end point scores in the nonresponder group. Taken together, these findings indicate that the IIEF is a highly sensitive and specific instrument for de-

TABLE VII. IIEF domain characteristics: sensitivity and specificity (study A)

Domain	n	Mean Change*	SEM	t Statistic	P Value
Treatment responders					
Erectile function	50	12.80	1.2	10.6	≤0.0001
Orgasmic function	50	3.44	0.5	6.4	≤0.0001
Sexual desire	49	1.12	0.3	4.5	≤0.0001
Intercourse satisfaction	48	4.63	0.6	8.4	≤0.0001
Overall satisfaction	49	3.47	0.4	8.4	≤0.0001
Treatment nonresponders					
Erectile function	42	0.88	0.8	1.07	0.67
Orgasmic function	42	0.70	0.6	1.25	0.36
Sexual desire	42	-0.52	0.3	-1.55	0.32
Intercourse satisfaction	42	0.10	0.4	0.27	0.79
Overall satisfaction	42	0.57	0.3	1.65	0.11

KEY: IIEF = International Index of Erectile Function.

* Mean difference between pretreatment score and post-treatment scores.

tecting changes in erectile function in response to treatment.

Other advantages of this new scale are worth noting. First, all of the major aspects of the NIH definition are addressed by individual items in the erectile function domain. A patient's ability to achieve or maintain an erection sufficient for intercourse are addressed separately (items 3 and 4, respectively), as is the degree of satisfaction achieved (item 7). The IIEF also addresses the ability to achieve erections independent of intercourse (items 1 and 2). Furthermore, the psychologic dimension of erectile confidence is assessed (item 15), which has been shown to be related to treatment outcome in other contexts.²⁴ Finally, the brevity and ease of comprehension of the measure provide important practical advantages. For example, the IIEF may be ideally suited for use in studies assessing the prevalence of ED in different countries.

Limitations of the instrument are the sole focus on current sexual functioning, the superficial assessment of nonerectile components of sexual response, and the limited assessment of the partner relationship. Although the IIEF provides a broad measure of sexual function across five domains, it should be viewed as an adjunct to, rather than a substitute for, a detailed sexual history. The IIEF was designed as an assessment measure for ED, and it is not intended for use as a primary measure of premature ejaculation or hypoactive sexual desire. Finally, the IIEF has not been evaluated in long-term follow-up studies or in the patient subpopulations that were excluded from the clinical trials described, such as those with anatomic deformities (for example, Peyronie's disease). Thus, further studies would be needed to determine whether this instrument is valid in these instances.

CONCLUSIONS

The IIEF, a 15-item questionnaire, has been developed and validated as a brief and reliable self-administered scale for assessing erectile function. This instrument is psychometrically sound and easy to administer in research and clinical settings. The IIEF currently is available in 10 languages for use in multinational clinical trials, and it demonstrates adequate sensitivity and specificity for detecting treatment-related changes in erectile function in patients with ED.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. To Drs. Pierre Wicker, Frances Quirk, Mike Hodges, Murray Maytom, David Cox, and Fidela Moreno, and to Mike Smith, Andrew Lee, Michelle Cuddigan, Jennifer Gill, and Claire Hargreaves for their valuable support and contributions, and to Dr. Patricia Leinen for her assistance in the preparation of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. NIH Consensus Development Panel on Impotence: Impotence. *JAMA* 270: 83-90, 1993.
2. Feldman HA, Goldstein I, Hatzichristou DG, Krane RJ, and McKinlay JB: Impotence and its medical and psychosocial correlates: results of the Massachusetts Male Aging Study. *J Urol* 151: 54-61, 1994.
3. Saenz de Tejada I, Goldstein I, Azadzo K, Krane RJ, and Cohen RA: Impaired neurogenic and endothelium-mediated relaxation of penile smooth muscle from diabetic men with impotence. *N Engl J Med* 320: 1025, 1989.
4. Shabsigh R, Fishman IJ, Schum C, and Dunn JK: Cigarette smoking and other risk factors in vasculogenic impotence. *Urology* 38: 227, 1991.
5. Conte HR: Development and use of self-report techniques for assessing sexual functioning: a review and critique. *Arch Sex Behav* 12: 555-576, 1983.
6. Anderson BL, and Broffitt B: Is there a reliable and valid self-report measure of sexual function? *Arch Sex Behav* 17: 509-525, 1988.
7. Stewart AL, and Ware JE: *Measuring Functioning and Well-Being*. Duke University Press, 1992.
8. Derogatis LR, and Melisaratos N: The DSFI: a multi-dimensional measure of sexual functioning. *J Sex Marital Ther* 5: 244-281, 1979.

9. Libman E, Rothenberg I, Fichten CS, and Amsel R: The SSES-E: a measure of sexual self-efficacy in erectile functioning. *J Sex Marital Ther* 11: 233-244, 1985.

10. Reynolds CF III, Frank E, Thase ME, Houck PR, Jennings JR, Howell JR, Lilienfeld SO, and Kupfer DJ: Assessment of sexual function in depressed, impotent, and healthy men: factor analysis of a Brief Sexual Function Questionnaire for men. *Psychiatry Res* 24: 231-250, 1988.

11. O'Leary MP, Fowler FJ, Lenderking WR, Sagnier PP, Guess HA, and Barry MJ: A brief male sexual function inventory for urology. *Urology* 46: 697-706, 1993.

12. Cronbach LJ: Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika* 16: 297, 1951.

13. Rosen R, Riley A, Wagner G, Osterloh I, Kirkpatrick J, and Mishra A: The Index of Erectile Dysfunction (IED): a multi-dimensional scale for assessment of male erectile dysfunction (abstract). *J Urol* 155: 466A, 1996.

14. Gorsuch RL: *Factor Analysis*. Philadelphia, WB Saunders, 1974.

15. Boolell M, Gepi-Attee S, Gingell JC, and Allen MJ: Sildenafil, a novel effective oral therapy for male erectile dysfunction. *Br J Urol* 78: 257-261, 1996.

16. Boolell M, Allen MJ, Ballard SA, Muirhead GJ, Naylor AM, Osterloh IH, and Gingell C: Sildenafil: an orally active type 5 cyclic GMP-specific phosphodiesterase inhibitor for the

treatment of penile erectile dysfunction. *Int J Impotence Res* 8: 47-52, 1996.

17. Kimmel D, and Van der Veen F: Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's marital adjustment test. *J Marriage Fam* 29: 57-63, 1974.

18. Crowne DP, and Marlowe D: A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 24: 349-354, 1960.

19. Kleinbaum DG, Kupper LL, and Morgenstern H: *Epidemiologic Research: Principles and Quantitative Methods*. New York, Lifetime Learning Publications, 1982, p 152.

20. Juniper EF, and Guyatt GH: Comparison of methods for selecting items for a disease-specific quality of life questionnaire: importance versus factor analysis. *Qual Life Res* 3: 51-52, 1994.

21. Hays RD, and Hadorn D: Responsiveness to change as an aspect of validity, not a separate dimension. *Qual Life Res* 1: 73-75, 1992.

22. Williams JI, and Naylor DC: How should health status measures be assessed? Cautionary notes on procrustean frameworks. *Clin Epidemiol* 45: 1347-1351, 1992.

23. Ware JD Jr: Standards for validating health measures: definition and content. *J Chron Dis* 40: 473-480, 1987.

24. Rosen RC, Leiblum SR, and Spector I: Psychologically based treatment for male erectile disorder: a cognitive-interpersonal model. *J Sex Marital Ther* 20: 67-85, 1994.

APPENDIX

Individual items of International Index of Erectile Function Questionnaire and response options (US version)

Question*	Response Options
Q1: How often were you able to get an erection during sexual activity?	0 = No sexual activity 1 = Almost never/never
Q2: When you had erections with sexual stimulation, how often were your erections hard enough for penetration?	2 = A few times (much less than half the time) 3 = Sometimes (about half the time) 4 = Most times (much more than half the time) 5 = Almost always/always
Q3: When you attempted sexual intercourse, how often were you able to penetrate (enter) your partner?	0 = Did not attempt intercourse 1 = Almost never/never
Q4: During sexual intercourse, how often were you able to maintain your erection after you had penetrated (entered) your partner?	2 = A few times (much less than half the time) 3 = Sometimes (about half the time) 4 = Most times (much more than half the time) 5 = Almost always/always
Q5: During sexual intercourse, how difficult was it to maintain your erection to completion of intercourse?	0 = Did not attempt intercourse 1 = Extremely difficult 2 = Very difficult 3 = Difficult 4 = Slightly difficult 5 = Not difficult
Q6: How many times have you attempted sexual intercourse?	0 = No attempts 1 = One to two attempts 2 = Three to four attempts 3 = Five to six attempts 4 = Seven to ten attempts 5 = Eleven+ attempts
Q7: When you attempted sexual intercourse, how often was it satisfactory for you?	0 = Did not attempt intercourse 1 = Almost never/never 2 = A few times (much less than half the time) 3 = Sometimes (about half the time) 4 = Most times (much more than half the time) 5 = Almost always/always

Q8: How much have you enjoyed sexual intercourse?

- 0 = No intercourse
- 1 = No enjoyment
- 2 = Not very enjoyable
- 3 = Fairly enjoyable
- 4 = Highly enjoyable
- 5 = Very highly enjoyable

Q9: When you had sexual stimulation or intercourse, how often did you ejaculate?

- 0 = No sexual stimulation/intercourse
- 1 = Almost never/never
- 2 = A few times (much less than half the time)
- 3 = Sometimes (about half the time)
- 4 = Most times (much more than half the time)
- 5 = Almost always/always

Q10: When you had sexual stimulation or intercourse, how often did you have the feeling of orgasm or climax?

- 1 = Almost never/never
- 2 = A few times (much less than half the time)
- 3 = Sometimes (about half the time)
- 4 = Most times (much more than half the time)
- 5 = Almost always/always

Q11: How often have you felt sexual desire?

- 1 = Very low/none at all
- 2 = Low
- 3 = Moderate
- 4 = High
- 5 = Very high

Q12: How would you rate your level of sexual desire?

Q13: How satisfied have you been with your overall sex life?

- 1 = Very dissatisfied
- 2 = Moderately dissatisfied
- 3 = About equally satisfied and dissatisfied
- 4 = Moderately satisfied
- 5 = Very satisfied

Q14: How satisfied have you been with your sexual relationship with your partner?

Q15: How do you rate your confidence that you could get and keep an erection?

- 1 = Very low
- 2 = Low
- 3 = Moderate
- 4 = High
- 5 = Very high

** All questions are preceded by the phrase "Over the past 4 weeks."*
