



Published in final edited form as:

J Rehabil Res Dev. 2015 ; 52(4): 385–396. doi:10.1682/JRRD.2014.09.0209.

Effects of prosthetic limb prescription on 3-year mortality among lower extremity veteran amputees

Jibby E. Kurichi, MPH¹, Pui Kwong, MPH¹, W. Bruce Vogel, PhD², Dawei Xie, PhD¹, Diane Cowper Ripley, PhD³, and Barbara E. Bates, MD⁴

¹Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

²Veterans Affairs Medical Center Gainesville, FL and Department of Health Outcomes and Policy, College of Medicine, University of Florida

³VA HSR&D/RR&D Rehabilitation Outcomes Research Center REAP North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System, Gainesville, FL and University of Florida, Department of Health Outcomes and Policy, College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL

⁴Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Albany, NY and Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY

Abstract

Our objective was to determine the relationship between receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb and three-year mortality post-surgery among veterans with lower extremity amputation. We conducted a retrospective observational study that included 4,578 veterans hospitalized for lower extremity amputation and discharged in Fiscal Years 2003 and 2004. The outcome was time to all-cause mortality from the amputation surgical date up to the 3-year anniversary of the surgical date. There were 1,300 (28.4%) veterans with lower extremity amputations who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb within a year after the surgical amputation. About 46% (n=2086) died within three-years of the surgical anniversary. Among those who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb, only 25.2% died within 3 years of the surgical anniversary. After adjustment, veterans who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb were less likely to die after the surgery than veterans without a prescription with a hazard ratio of 0.68 (95% CI, 0.60-0.77). Findings demonstrated that veterans with lower extremity amputations who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb within a year after the surgical amputation were less likely to die within three years of the surgical amputation after controlling for patient-, treatment-, and facility-level characteristics.

Corresponding author: Jibby E. Kurichi, MPH. Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, The Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania. 907 Blockley Hall, 423 Guardian Drive, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6021, 215-898-8490 (phone); 215-573-2017 (fax); jkurichi@mail.med.upenn.edu.

Author contributions:

Study design: Kurichi, Xie, Kwong

Analysis and statistical interpretation of the data: Kwong, Xie, Kurichi, Vogel

Drafting of the manuscript: Kurichi

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Bates, Kwong, Xie, Cowper, Vogel

Obtained funding: Bates, Kurichi

Administrative technical or material support: Kurichi

There are no personal conflicts of interest of any of the authors.

Keywords

prosthetic limb; mortality; veterans; lower extremity amputation; outcomes; time dependent covariate; methods

INTRODUCTION

Lower extremity amputation is a life altering event, affecting the patient's quality of life and health, as well as their functional, economic, and psychosocial status.(1) It has been shown that there is a decrease in social participation, employment, and overall general functioning within the community following an amputation.(2) Comorbid conditions,(3) such as depression, may set in, making it difficult for people to return to their normal activities post-amputation. In addition, families may be affected as they may view the amputation as a burden forcing unwanted changes in their own lives such as modifying their work schedules or adjusting their living environment if the patient cannot return home safely without the changes.(4) Conversely, family members may become very overprotective and assist the person with the amputation such that the person may not achieve optimal functional recovery.

Rehabilitation can assist the person with an amputation regain as much function as possible. One important component of rehabilitation is the prescription and receipt of a prosthetic limb for those who are able to use one.(5) A prosthetic limb could help improve mobility, potentially leading to better quality of life. Improved mobility can allow the prosthetic wearer to be more independent in performing Activities of Daily Living (ADLs), potentially requiring less assistance from another person. Patients who have had rehabilitation for prosthetic training have shown to have higher levels of physical and cognitive functioning. (6) Even gains in low levels of physical independence achieved through rehabilitation showed improved one-year survival post-surgery among veterans with lower extremity amputation.(7)

We previously demonstrated that younger veterans, those with trans-tibial compared to trans-femoral lower extremity amputations, and those initially evaluated with higher physical and cognitive abilities were more likely to receive a prescription for a prosthetic limb. Factors negatively influencing receipt of a prosthetic limb included admission to the hospital from extended care compared to home, numerous amputation etiologies, comorbidities, and undergoing certain procedures while hospitalized.(8) We also showed that older age, higher amputation level, more comorbidities, evidence of inpatient procedures for pulmonary and renal problems, central nervous system (CNS) procedures, treatment on an intensive care unit (ICU), or medical bed section (i.e., cardiology, pulmonary) compared to a surgical bed section (i.e., neurosurgery, thoracic surgery), and regional differences were associated with one-year mortality post-surgery among veterans with lower extremity amputation.(9, 10)

One study conducted at a non-university teaching center found that the hazards of death for prosthetic users among patients who had lower extremity amputations was 80% less than for non-prosthetic wearers after adjusting for age, diagnosis, pre-functional status, and presence

of coronary artery disease.(11) However, we do not know the relationship between the receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb and mortality post-surgery among veterans with lower extremity amputation. We hypothesized that after controlling for various patient-level, treatment-level, and facility-level characteristics, receiving a prescription for a prosthetic limb would reduce the hazards of death.

METHODS

This study was approved by the institutional review boards at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Samuel S. Stratton Veterans Affairs Medical Center (VAMC), Albany, New York, and the North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System (NF/SG VHS), Gainesville, Florida as well as by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Research and Development Committees in Albany and Gainesville.

Data Description

Data used for this study were obtained from eight Veterans Health Administration (VHA) administrative databases: Patient Treatment File (PTF) inpatient database (main, bed section, surgical, procedure), two Outpatient Care Files, VA Beneficiary Identification Records Locator Subsystem (BIRLS) Death File, and the National Prosthetics Patient Database (NPPD). These databases were described and applied in previous articles,(8, 9) and have been shown to be accurate and reliable.(12-20)

In order to acquire additional information on those veterans who obtained a prescription for a prosthetic limb in the private sector after being discharged from the VAMC where the surgical amputation occurred, the Durable Medical Equipment (DME) file from the Chronic Condition Data Warehouse of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) was used to extract receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb. DME is a Non-Institutional claims database, which includes International Classification of Diseases-Ninth Revision-Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) diagnosis codes, Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes, and dates of service submitted by DME suppliers and providers. (21)

Study Cohort Selection

There were 4,697 veterans admitted for lower extremity amputation from 125 VAMCs with acute discharge dates between October 1, 2002, and September 30, 2004 (Fiscal Years 2003 and 2004). Cases were limited to trans-tibial, trans-femoral, and hip disarticulation (surgical ICD-9-CM procedure codes: 84.10, 84.13-84.19, and 84.91).(22) Our exposure timeframe was limited to one-year post-surgery because typically patients only receive a prescription for a prosthetic limb within this timeframe (see below). Prescriptions received after the one-year post-surgery anniversary may be related to another amputation or may affect longer-term survival thus, 116 subjects were removed because their prescriptions were obtained outside of the one-year post-surgery criteria. One subject was removed for missing living location before hospitalization, and two subjects were excluded for their unspecified amputation level. Thus, 4,578 subjects remained in the study for analyses.

Exposure Measure

Receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb was the time varying independent exposure, which was measured from the amputation surgical date to its one-year anniversary date and was obtained from the NPPD and DME files.

Outcome

The outcome was time to all-cause mortality measured from the amputation surgical date up to 3-years. The BIRLS database was used to identify the date of death.(23)

Covariates Description

Patient-level characteristics—The sociodemographics included age, categorized as 65, 66-80, and 81 years old, gender, marital status (married versus unmarried), living location before hospitalization (extended care versus non-VA hospital or home), and patient residential setting (rural versus urban). Amputation level was categorized as either trans-tibial or trans-femoral amputation. Hip disarticulations were combined with trans-femoral amputation because of low prevalence (n=33) and to create one “above knee” category as in our previous studies.(7-10, 24-35) The new category is referred to as trans-femoral/hip disarticulation.

The contributing amputation etiologies, previously categorized by our group,(9) were identified by using ICD-9-CM diagnosis codes from PTF main and bed section files from admission up to the surgical date and from the outpatient care files from 3 months before the hospitalization admission date

The Elixhauser comorbidity index was our primary measure of comorbidities, identified through ICD-9-CM codes from the outpatient care files 3 months before the hospitalization, and from the inpatient main and bed section files up to the surgical date.(36) Diabetes mellitus and peripheral vascular disease were categorized as amputation etiologies rather than comorbidities.

Three additional clinical covariates were controlled for because the literature(8, 37-47) showed that they may contribute to the receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb. These clinical covariates included dementia, stroke, and vision impairment based on ICD-9-CM codes found in Table 1.

Treatment- level characteristics—Hospital events and diagnostic tests were captured from the Inpatient Procedure File from the hospital admission up to the surgical date, which included data regarding active pulmonary pathology, acute central nervous system, ongoing active cardiac pathology, ongoing wound problems, serious nutritional compromise, severe renal disease, and substance abuse/mental health issues.(8) Admission on a medical or surgical ICU anytime between the hospital admission to the surgical date, and the length to stay from admission to surgery were included to approximate patient complexity.

Facility-level characteristics—Hospital geographic setting (rural versus urban), VAMC geographic regions (Southeast versus Northeast, Midwest, South Central, or Mountain

Pacific), and hospital size estimated by total number of beds (8-126 versus 127-244, 245-362, or 363-480) were included.

Other—A year variable was added to control for any differences that may have occurred in clinical practice over the two years. Year 1 (Fiscal Year 2003) included veterans discharged from October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003, and year 2 (Fiscal Year 2004) included veterans discharged from October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.

Statistical Analyses

Baseline patient-, treatment-, and facility-level characteristics were compared between veterans who received and did not receive a prescription of prosthetic limb, and between those who died and did not die within 3 years of the surgery to provide a frequency distribution of the variables. Frequency and proportions were presented for the categorical variables, and means and standard deviations (SDs) for the continuous variables. Chi-square tests and Student t-tests were used to evaluate the differences between the exposure and outcome of interest to describe the cohort.

A Cox regression model was used to estimate the hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Patient-level, treatment-level, facility-level characteristics, and year were the dependent variables. The receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb was added to the model as a time dependent covariate. For veterans who died within the three-year anniversary period after the surgery, the time to event variable was defined as the time between the PTF surgery date and date of death. For veterans who did not die within the three-year anniversary period, time to event was defined as the time between the PTF surgery date and end of study. Variables included in the final model were selected based on clinical relevance and were only used to control for potential confounding. We used ID statement in PROC PHREG in SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North Carolina) and VAMC is specified as the ID variable so the correlation among veterans from the same VAMC was accounted for. We applied criteria established by Belsley and coworkers(48) and used an approach illustrated by Mason(49) to test collinearity between the variables. A condition index larger than 20 is a clear indication of harmful collinearity. All statistical significance was defined by $p < 0.05$, two-sided.

RESULTS

Among the total sample of 4,578 veterans, 1,300 (28.4%) veterans with lower extremity amputations received a prescription for a prosthetic limb within a year after the surgical amputation. Two thousand eight-six veterans (45.6%) died within three-years of the surgical anniversary. Among those who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb, only 25.2% died within 3 years of the surgical anniversary. The overall average age of this cohort was 66.9 (SD=11.2) years and 99.1% were male.

Table 2 shows the unadjusted patient characteristics comparing patients who received and did not receive a prescription for a prosthetic limb within a year of the surgical amputation. Table 3 shows the unadjusted associations of patient characteristics between patients who did and did not die within 3-years of the surgery. Both tables provide a frequency

distribution of the variables and only display variables that were significant in the Cox regression model.

There were no concerns regarding collinearity among the variables in the final model since the largest condition index was 1.91. After adjusting for patient-, treatment-, and facility-level variables and year, veterans who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb were less likely to die after the surgery than veterans without a prescription (HR=0.68, 95% CI, 0.60-0.77). The hazard ratios of other patient-level and treatment-level variables significant in the Cox regression model are presented in Table 4 and are only in the model for adjustment purposes.

DISCUSSION

Findings supported our hypothesis that veterans with lower extremity amputations who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb within a year after the surgical amputation were less likely to die within three years of the surgical amputation after controlling for patient-, treatment-, and facility-level characteristics and year. Moreover, our time varying variable of receipt for prescription for a prosthetic limb demonstrated that the time to receipt of the prescription for a limb was associated with lower hazards of mortality. More specifically, the earlier the prescription for a prosthetic limb was received, the lower the hazards of mortality were. This makes clinical sense as patients who do not have any post-surgery or late complications may be more likely to be fitted early with a prosthesis.(50) Those with wound infections or slow healing surgical sites, severe cardiovascular disease, local or systemic infections, or other complicating factors such as non-healing wounds on their sound limb may see significant delays in the prosthetic fitting process. These patients may be more medically compromised in general than those who tolerate the surgery and post-surgery recovery without any complications, and thus have a higher mortality rate in general. The early prosthetic prescription may simply be a marker for good health and healthier people generally live longer.

However, it is critical that patients who would benefit from a prescription for a prosthetic limb obtain one as soon as they are medically stable. Post-discharge plans to assure patients return to see a prosthetic team should be a priority as intensive rehabilitation follow-up after hospital discharge could increase the prevalence of prosthetic limb users. Tracking patients via an amputation clinic or other rehabilitation clinic until they are ready for a prosthetic prescription might make a difference in timing of the prescription for those delayed by complicating factors and ultimately may result in greater survival.

Early fitting for a prosthesis may also provide a psychological boost to patients' motivation, thus further promoting their overall health status.(51) The perception that they are "ready" for a prosthesis and the therapy needed to be a successful prosthetic limb user can bolster a patient's confidence and sense of wellbeing. There needs to be emphasis on the role of social and psychological factors when evaluating and tailoring interventions to enable the optimal use of the prosthetic limb so that patients experience positive outcomes, such as increased social participation and community reintegration, higher quality of life, and reduce burden on the family and community.(41)

Considering psychosocial factors(50) along with physical when prescribing prosthetic limbs and targeting rehabilitation to the specific needs of the prosthetic wearer rather than focusing solely on improving function will be beneficial to the prosthetic wearer. The way the person with amputation creates meaning out of their experience influences their attitude towards use and acceptance of the prosthetic limb. The user has to believe that his or her life is worth living and needs to be able to integrate the new device into their lives.(52) When other factors are considered, quality of life will be improved and prolong survival in general. More often than not, the psychological wellbeing of the individual is more important than the fact the individual had an amputation.(53)

Provision of a prosthetic limb is typically considered for community-level ambulation, but this may be an unreachable goal for many patients with lower extremity amputations.(4) Safe transfers and short distance household ambulation may be the highest functional goal achieved by many and for others, provision of a prosthetic limb for aesthetics may be the only goal but it should not be discounted.

Prosthetic fitting rates have ranged from 50%-90% among patients with trans-tibial or trans-femoral amputations(54) while rates of actual prosthetic use have ranged from 49%-95%. (44, 55, 56) This raises a question regarding the appropriateness and effectiveness of the prosthetic intervention. Patients who receive a prosthesis may not be using the device for its full potential(57) or appropriate rehabilitation goals were not clearly developed in collaboration with the patient. One study showed that veterans who had lower extremity amputations who were in possession of a prosthetic limb primarily used a wheelchair for mobility.(57) Another study demonstrated that 16% of non-users never wore their prosthetic limb and 33% had thrown their prosthesis out during the first year.(58) Non-users may reject a prosthetic limb because of poor fit(58) or possibly because they were not adequately trained and do not feel safe using it. It will be important to address the use and nonuse of prosthetic limbs in the future especially because of the increasing costs of prosthetic limbs and the increasing prevalence of lower extremity amputations.

There were several limitations in this study. Findings may not generalize to the entire population since this was a study which included veterans. Moreover, the majority of veterans are males so it is unknown if findings can be generalized to females. Race was not included because of the large amount of missing information in the VA administrative databases. Also, although functional outcomes of those with hip disarticulations differ from those with trans-femoral amputations, we combined the two types of amputation levels because of low prevalence among those with hip disarticulations. Furthermore, it may be that more prosthetic prescriptions are written for healthier patients or that people who are most seriously ill or disabled and likely to die are much less likely to be written a prescription. Although we have attempted to control for patient characteristics, it is difficult to fully adjust for confounding by indication in clinical research especially using retrospective data. There may be other factors influencing the receipt of a prosthetic prescription that are also related to mortality that we were not able to identify, obtain, or differentiate in the data. Consequently, the association between receipt of a prosthetic limb and lower mortality should not be interpreted as causal. While we cannot make strict causal inferences, it is noteworthy that the statistical significance of the receipt of a prescription for

a prosthetic limb remains even after accounting for many potential confounding clinical conditions.

CONCLUSIONS

Even after controlling for other factors known to be associated with mortality such as age, amputation level, and numerous comorbidities,(7, 9, 10, 22, 59-65) early receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb was a strong factor associated with lower mortality. Given that some patients may not be suitable, combined with the small cost of a prosthesis, this leads to a dilemma worth exploring because of the mortality benefit demonstrated in this study among those who received a prescription for a prosthetic limb. Clinicians need to address the users' specific psychological, social, and physical needs when prescribing prosthetic limbs. Follow-up physical examinations should also resolve issues surrounding fit and delivery systems. Patient-centered care, including patient's choice, opinion, and acceptance of prosthesis, can lead to higher prosthetic use and longer survival.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Margaret G. Stineman, MD Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, for her conceptual design of this study.

No authors reported disclosures beyond the funding source. The opinions and conclusions of the authors are not necessarily those of the sponsoring agencies.

The research for this manuscript was supported by the National Institutes of Health (R01-HD042588-05A2). It is also supported by resources and the use of facilities at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Samuel S. Stratton Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Albany, New York, and the North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System (NF/SG VHS) in Gainesville, Florida. Support for VA/CMS data is provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration, Office of Research and Development, Health Services Research and Development, VA Information Resource Center (Project Numbers SDR 02-237 and 98-004).

Abbreviations

(ADLs)	Activities of Daily Living
(CNS)	Central nervous system
(ICU)	Intensive care unit
(VAMC)	Veterans Affairs Medical Center
(NF/SG VHS)	North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System
(VA)	Department of Veterans Affairs
(VHA)	Veterans Health Administration
(PTF)	Patient Treatment File
(BIRLS)	Beneficiary Identification Records Locator Subsystem
(NPPD)	National Prosthetics Patient Database
(DME)	Durable Medical Equipment

(CMS)	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
(ICD-9-CM)	International Classification of Diseases-Ninth Revision-Clinical Modification
(HCPCS)	Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System
(SDs)	Standard deviations
(HRs)	Hazard ratios
(CIs)	Confidence intervals

REFERENCES

1. Lefebvre KM, Lavery LA. Disparities in amputations in minorities. *Clinical orthopaedics and related research*. Jul; 2011 469(7):1941–50. PubMed PMID: 21384209. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3111767. [PubMed: 21384209]
2. Medhat A, Huber PM, Medhat MA. Factors that influence the level of activities in persons with lower extremity amputation. *Rehabilitation nursing : the official journal of the Association of Rehabilitation Nurses*. Jan-Feb;1990 15(1):13–8. PubMed PMID: 2300691. [PubMed: 2300691]
3. Horgan O, MacLachlan M. Psychosocial adjustment to lower-limb amputation: a review. *Disability and rehabilitation*. Jul; 2004 26(14-15):837–50. 22-Aug 5. PubMed PMID: 15497913. [PubMed: 15497913]
4. Pohjolainen T, Alaranta H, Karkkainen M. Prosthetic use and functional and social outcome following major lower limb amputation. *Prosthetics and orthotics international*. Aug; 1990 14(2): 75–9. PubMed PMID: 2235304. [PubMed: 2235304]
5. Schaffalitzky E, Gallagher P, Maclachlan M, Wegener ST. Developing consensus on important factors associated with lower limb prosthetic prescription and use. *Disability and rehabilitation*. 2012; 34(24):2085–94. PubMed PMID: 22494367. [PubMed: 22494367]
6. Hershkovitz A, Dudkiewicz I, Brill S. Rehabilitation outcome of post-acute lower limb geriatric amputees. *Disability and rehabilitation*. Feb; 2013 35(3):221–7. PubMed PMID: 22686166. [PubMed: 22686166]
7. Stineman MG, Kurichi JE, Kwong PL, Maislin G, Reker DM, Vogel WB, et al. Survival analysis in amputees based on physical independence grade achievement. *Archives of surgery*. Jun; 2009 144(6):543–51. discussion 52. PubMed PMID: 19528388. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2869628. [PubMed: 19528388]
8. Kurichi JE, Kwong PL, Reker DM, Bates BE, Marshall CR, Stineman MG. Clinical factors associated with prescription of a prosthetic limb in elderly veterans. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. Jun; 2007 55(6):900–6. PubMed PMID: 17537091. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3700729. [PubMed: 17537091]
9. Bates B, Stineman MG, Reker DM, Kurichi JE, Kwong PL. Risk factors associated with mortality in veteran population following transtibial or transfemoral amputation. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. Nov-Dec;2006 43(7):917–28. PubMed PMID: 17436177. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2749288. [PubMed: 17436177]
10. Bates BE, Xie D, Kurichi JE, Cowper Ripley D, Kwong PL, Stineman MG. Revisiting risks associated with mortality following initial transtibial or transfemoral amputation. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2012; 49(10):1479–92. PubMed PMID: 23516052. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3628826. [PubMed: 23516052]
11. Taylor SM, Kalbaugh CA, Blackhurst DW, Hamontree SE, Cull DL, Messich HS, et al. Preoperative clinical factors predict postoperative functional outcomes after major lower limb amputation: an analysis of 553 consecutive patients. *Journal of vascular surgery*. Aug; 2005 42(2): 227–35. PubMed PMID: 16102618. [PubMed: 16102618]

12. Washington DL, Sun S, Canning M. Creating a sampling frame for population-based veteran research: representativeness and overlap of VA and Department of Defense databases. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(8):763–71. PubMed PMID: 21110250. [PubMed: 21110250]
13. Smith MW, Su P, Phibbs CS. Matching prosthetics order records in VA National Prosthetics Patient Database to healthcare utilization databases. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(8):725–37. PubMed PMID: 21110248. [PubMed: 21110248]
14. Smith BM, Evans CT, Ullrich P, Burns S, Guihan M, Miskevics S, et al. Using VA data for research in persons with spinal cord injuries and disorders: lessons from SCI QUERI. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(8):679–88. PubMed PMID: 21110243. [PubMed: 21110243]
15. Harris AH, Reeder RN, Ellerbe L, Bowe T. Are VHA administrative location codes valid indicators of specialty substance use disorder treatment? *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(8):699–708. PubMed PMID: 21110245. [PubMed: 21110245]
16. Fischer MJ, Stroupe KT, Hynes DM, Blemur P, Sohn MW, Browning MM, et al. Validation of erythropoietin use data on Medicare’s End-Stage Renal Disease Medical Evidence Report. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(8):751–62. PubMed PMID: 21110249. [PubMed: 21110249]
17. Carlson KF, Nugent SM, Grill J, Sayer NA. Accuracy of external cause-of-injury coding in VA polytrauma patient discharge records. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(8):689–97. PubMed PMID: 21110244. [PubMed: 21110244]
18. Berlowitz DR, Hickey EC, Saliba D. Can administrative data identify active diagnoses for long-term care resident assessment? *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(8):719–24. PubMed PMID: 21110247. [PubMed: 21110247]
19. Cowper DC, Hynes DM, Kubal JD, Murphy PA. Using administrative databases for outcomes research: select examples from VA Health Services Research and Development. *Journal of medical systems*. Jun; 1999 23(3):249–59. PubMed PMID: 10554740. [PubMed: 10554740]
20. Murphy PA, Cowper DC, Seppala G, Stroupe KT, Hynes DM. Veterans Health Administration inpatient and outpatient care data: an overview. *Effective clinical practice : ECP*. May-Jun;2002 5(3 Suppl):E4. PubMed PMID: 12166925. [PubMed: 12166925]
21. Schneider, KRM.; Brenton, M. Chronic Condition Data Warehouse: Getting Started with CMS Medicare Administrative Research Files -A Technical Guidance Paper. 2011.
22. Mayfield JA, Reiber GE, Maynard C, Czerniecki JM, Caps MT, Sangeorzan BJ. Survival following lower-limb amputation in a veteran population. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. May-Jun;2001 38(3):341–5. PubMed PMID: 11440266. [PubMed: 11440266]
23. Powell, TMBM. [cited 2013 October 22] Your “survival” guide to using time-dependent covariates San Diego. 2012. Available from: support.sas.com/resources/papers/proceedings12/168-2012.pdf
24. Bates BE, Hallenbeck R, Ferrario T, Kwong PL, Kurichi JE, Stineman MG, et al. Patient-, treatment-, and facility-level structural characteristics associated with the receipt of preoperative lower extremity amputation rehabilitation. *PM & R : the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation*. Jan; 2013 5(1):16–23. PubMed PMID: 22939239. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3570975.
25. Bates BE, Kurichi JE, Marshall CR, Reker D, Maislin G, Stineman MG. Does the presence of a specialized rehabilitation unit in a Veterans Affairs facility impact referral for rehabilitative care after a lower-extremity amputation? *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. Oct; 2007 88(10):1249–55. PubMed PMID: 17908565. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3682474. [PubMed: 17908565]
26. Bates BE, Kwong PL, Kurichi JE, Bidelspach DE, Reker DM, Maislin G, et al. Factors influencing decisions to admit patients to veterans affairs specialized rehabilitation units after lower-extremity amputation. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. Dec; 2009 90(12):2012–8. PubMed PMID: 19969162. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2873109. [PubMed: 19969162]
27. Kurichi JE, Ripley DC, Xie D, Kwong PL, Bates BE, Stineman MG. Factors associated with home discharge after rehabilitation among male veterans with lower extremity amputation. *PM & R : the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation*. May; 2013 5(5):408–17. PubMed PMID: 23159239. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3718007.

28. Kurichi JE, Small DS, Bates BE, Prvu-Bettger JA, Kwong PL, Vogel WB, et al. Possible incremental benefits of specialized rehabilitation bed units among veterans after lower extremity amputation. *Med Care.* Apr; 2009 47(4):457–65. PubMed PMID: 19238103. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2865891. [PubMed: 19238103]
29. Kurichi JE, Stineman MG, Kwong PL, Bates BE, Reker DM. Assessing and using comorbidity measures in elderly veterans with lower extremity amputations. *Gerontology.* 2007; 53(5):255–9. PubMed PMID: 17435390. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3662494. [PubMed: 17435390]
30. Kurichi JE, Vogel WB, Kwong PL, Xie D, Bates BE, Stineman MG. Factors associated with total inpatient costs and length of stay during surgical hospitalization among veterans who underwent lower extremity amputation. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation / Association of Academic Physiatrists.* Mar; 2013 92(3):203–14. PubMed PMID: 23117271. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3601547. [PubMed: 23117271]
31. Kurichi JE, Xie D, Kwong PL, Bates BE, Vogel WB, Stineman MG. Factors associated with late specialized rehabilitation among veterans with lower extremity amputation who underwent immediate postoperative rehabilitation. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation / Association of Academic Physiatrists.* May; 2011 90(5):387–98. PubMed PMID: 21389847. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3116952. [PubMed: 21389847]
32. Prvu-Bettger JA, Bates BE, Bidelspach DE, Stineman MG. Short- and long-term prognosis among veterans with neurological disorders and subsequent lower-extremity amputation. *Neuroepidemiology.* 2009; 32(1):4–10. PubMed PMID: 18997471. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2790599. [PubMed: 18997471]
33. Stineman MG, Kwong PL, Kurichi JE, Prvu-Bettger JA, Vogel WB, Maislin G, et al. The effectiveness of inpatient rehabilitation in the acute postoperative phase of care after transtibial or transfemoral amputation: study of an integrated health care delivery system. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.* Oct; 2008 89(10):1863–72. PubMed PMID: 18929014. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2880880. [PubMed: 18929014]
34. Stineman MG, Kwong PL, Xie D, Kurichi JE, Ripley DC, Brooks DM, et al. Prognostic differences for functional recovery after major lower limb amputation: effects of the timing and type of inpatient rehabilitation services in the Veterans Health Administration. *PM & R : the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation.* Apr; 2010 2(4):232–43. PubMed PMID: 20430324. Pubmed Central PMCID: 2917913.
35. Zhou J, Bates BE, Kurichi JE, Kwong PL, Xie D, Stineman MG. Factors influencing receipt of outpatient rehabilitation services among veterans following lower extremity amputation. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.* Sep; 2011 92(9):1455–61. PubMed PMID: 21878217. Pubmed Central PMCID: 3188813. [PubMed: 21878217]
36. Elixhauser A, Steiner C, Harris DR, Coffey RM. Comorbidity Measures for Use with Administrative Data. *Med Care.* Jan; 1998 36(1):8–27. PubMed PMID: 9431328. [PubMed: 9431328]
37. Beekman CE, Axtell LA. Prosthetic use in elderly patients with dysvascular above-knee and through-knee amputations. *Physical therapy.* Oct; 1987 67(10):1510–6. PubMed PMID: 3659135. [PubMed: 3659135]
38. Callaghan B, Condie E, Johnston M. Using the common sense self-regulation model to determine psychological predictors of prosthetic use and activity limitations in lower limb amputees. *Prosthetics and orthotics international.* Sep; 2008 32(3):324–36. PubMed PMID: 18825576. [PubMed: 18825576]
39. Fletcher DD, Andrews KL, Hallett JW Jr, Butters MA, Rowland CM, Jacobsen SJ. Trends in rehabilitation after amputation for geriatric patients with vascular disease: implications for future health resource allocation. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.* Oct; 2002 83(10):1389–93. PubMed PMID: 12370874. [PubMed: 12370874]
40. Johannesson A, Larsson GU, Ramstrand N, Lauge-Pedersen H, Wagner P, Atroshi I. Outcomes of a standardized surgical and rehabilitation program in transtibial amputation for peripheral vascular disease: a prospective cohort study. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation / Association of Academic Physiatrists.* Apr; 2010 89(4):293–303. PubMed PMID: 20134308. [PubMed: 20134308]

41. Larner S, van Ross E, Hale C. Do psychological measures predict the ability of lower limb amputees to learn to use a prosthesis? *Clinical rehabilitation*. Aug; 2003 17(5):493–8. PubMed PMID: 12952154. [PubMed: 12952154]
42. Leung EC, Rush PJ, Devlin M. Predicting prosthetic rehabilitation outcome in lower limb amputee patients with the functional independence measure. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. Jun; 1996 77(6):605–8. PubMed PMID: 8831480. [PubMed: 8831480]
43. O'Neill BF, Evans JJ. Memory and executive function predict mobility rehabilitation outcome after lower-limb amputation. *Disability and rehabilitation*. 2009; 31(13):1083–91. PubMed PMID: 19280435. [PubMed: 19280435]
44. Schoppen T, Boonstra A, Groothoff JW, de Vries J, Goeken LN, Eisma WH. Physical, mental, and social predictors of functional outcome in unilateral lower-limb amputees. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. Jun; 2003 84(6):803–11. PubMed PMID: 12808530. [PubMed: 12808530]
45. Steinberg FU, Sunwoo I, Roettger RF. Prosthetic rehabilitation of geriatric amputee patients: a follow-up study. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. Nov; 1985 66(11):742–5. PubMed PMID: 4062526. [PubMed: 4062526]
46. Traballese M, Brunelli S, Pratesi L, Pulcini M, Angioni C, Paolucci S. Prognostic factors in rehabilitation of above knee amputees for vascular diseases. *Disability and rehabilitation*. Oct; 1998 20(10):380–4. PubMed PMID: 9793752. [PubMed: 9793752]
47. Wolf E, Lilling M, Ferber I, Marcus J. Prosthetic rehabilitation of elderly bilateral amputees. *International journal of rehabilitation research Internationale Zeitschrift fur Rehabilitationsforschung Revue internationale de recherches de readaptation*. 1989; 12(3):271–8. PubMed PMID: 2630503. [PubMed: 2630503]
48. Belsley, D.; Kuh, E.; Welsch, R. *Regression Diagnostics*. John Wiley; New York: 1980.
49. Mason G. Coping with Collinearity. *Can J Program Eval*. 1987; 2:87–93.
50. Campbell WB, Ridler BM. Predicting the use of prostheses by vascular amputees. *European journal of vascular and endovascular surgery : the official journal of the European Society for Vascular Surgery*. Oct; 1996 12(3):342–5. PubMed PMID: 8896478.
51. Fleury AM, Salih SA, Peel NM. Rehabilitation of the older vascular amputee: a review of the literature. *Geriatrics & gerontology international*. Apr; 2013 13(2):264–73. PubMed PMID: 23279009. [PubMed: 23279009]
52. MacLachlan, M.; Gallagher, P. *Imagining the body*. In: Gallagher, P.; MacLachlan, M., editors. *Enabling Technologies: Body Image and Body Function*. Churchill-Livingstone; Edinburgh: 2004.
53. Fitzpatrick MC. The psychologic assessment and psychosocial recovery of the patient with an amputation. *Clinical orthopaedics and related research*. Apr.1999 (361):98–107. PubMed PMID: 10212602. [PubMed: 10212602]
54. Fletcher DD, Andrews KL, Butters MA, Jacobsen SJ, Rowland CM, Hallett JW Jr. Rehabilitation of the geriatric vascular amputee patient: a population-based study. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. Jun; 2001 82(6):776–9. PubMed PMID: 11387582. [PubMed: 11387582]
55. Pezzin LE, Dillingham TR, Mackenzie EJ, Ephraim P, Rossbach P. Use and satisfaction with prosthetic limb devices and related services. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. May; 2004 85(5):723–9. PubMed PMID: 15129395. [PubMed: 15129395]
56. Reiber GE, McFarland LV, Hubbard S, Maynard C, Blough DK, Gambel JM, et al. Servicemembers and veterans with major traumatic limb loss from Vietnam war and OIF/OEF conflicts: survey methods, participants, and summary findings. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2010; 47(4):275–97. PubMed PMID: 20803399. [PubMed: 20803399]
57. Karmarkar AM, Collins DM, Wichman T, Franklin A, Fitzgerald SG, Dicianno BE, et al. Prosthesis and wheelchair use in veterans with lower-limb amputation. *Journal of rehabilitation research and development*. 2009; 46(5):567–76. PubMed PMID: 19882491. [PubMed: 19882491]
58. Gauthier-Gagnon C, Grise M-C, Potvin D. Predisposing factors related to prosthetic use by people with a transtibial and transfemoral amputation. *Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics*. 1998; 10:99–109.

59. Aulivola B, Hile CN, Hamdan AD, Sheahan MG, Veraldi JR, Skillman JJ, et al. Major lower extremity amputation: outcome of a modern series. *Archives of surgery*. Apr; 2004 139(4):395–9. discussion 9. PubMed PMID: 15078707. [PubMed: 15078707]
60. Collins TC, Johnson M, Daley J, Henderson WG, Khuri SF, Gordon HS. Preoperative risk factors for 30-day mortality after elective surgery for vascular disease in Department of Veterans Affairs hospitals: is race important? *Journal of vascular surgery*. Oct; 2001 34(4):634–40. PubMed PMID: 11668317. [PubMed: 11668317]
61. Feinglass J, Pearce WH, Martin GJ, Gibbs J, Cowper D, Sorensen M, et al. Postoperative and late survival outcomes after major amputation: findings from the Department of Veterans Affairs National Surgical Quality Improvement Program. *Surgery*. Jul; 2001 130(1):21–9. PubMed PMID: 11436008. [PubMed: 11436008]
62. Kantonen I, Lepantalo M, Luther M, Salenius P, Ylonen K. Factors affecting the results of surgery for chronic critical leg ischemia—a nationwide survey. *Finnvasc Study Group. Journal of vascular surgery*. May; 1998 27(5):940–7. PubMed PMID: 9620148. [PubMed: 9620148]
63. O’Hare AM, Feinglass J, Reiber GE, Rodriguez RA, Daley J, Khuri S, et al. Postoperative mortality after nontraumatic lower extremity amputation in patients with renal insufficiency. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology : JASN*. Feb; 2004 15(2):427–34. PubMed PMID: 14747390. [PubMed: 14747390]
64. Pohjolainen T, Alaranta H. Ten-year survival of Finnish lower limb amputees. *Prosthetics and orthotics international*. Apr; 1998 22(1):10–6. PubMed PMID: 9604271. [PubMed: 9604271]
65. Remes L, Isoaho R, Vahlberg T, Hiekkanen H, Korhonen K, Viitanen M, et al. Major lower extremity amputation in elderly patients with peripheral arterial disease: incidence and survival rates. *Aging clinical and experimental research*. Oct; 2008 20(5):385–93. PubMed PMID: 19039278. [PubMed: 19039278]

Table 1

ICD-9-CM codes for Dementia, Stroke, and Visual Impairment

Condition	ICD-9-CM codes
Dementia	2900, 2901, 29010, 29011, 29012, 29013, 2902, 29020, 29021, 2903, 2904, 29040, 29041, 29042, 29043, 2908, 2909, 2941, 29410, 29411, 2948, 2942, 29420, 29421, 2949, 3310, 3311, 33111, 33119, 3312, 33182, 797
Stroke	430, 431, 432, 4320, 4321, 4329, 433, 43300, 43301, 43310, 43311, 43330, 43331, 43380, 43381, 43390, 43391, 434, 43400, 43401, 43410, 43411, 43490, 43491, 436, 438, 4380, 4381, 43810, 43811, 43812, 43819, 4382, 43821, 43822, 43830, 43831, 43832, 43840, 43841, 43842, 4385, 43850, 43851, 43852, 43853, 4386, 4387, 4388, 43882, 43883, 43884, 43885, 43889, 4389
Visual Impairment	36041, 36042, 36841, 36845, 36846, 36847, 369, 3690, 36900, 36901, 36902, 36903, 36904, 36905, 36906, 36907, 36908, 3691, 36910, 36911, 36912, 36913, 36914, 36915, 36916, 36917, 36918, 3692, 36920, 36921, 36922, 36923, 36924, 36925, 3693, 3694, 37775, 9509

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2

Distribution of characteristics by receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb

Variable	Total N (%)	Received prescription	Did not receive prescription	p-value
Patient-level				
Age in years, mean (SD)	66.9 (11.2)	63.6 (10.5)	68.3 (11.2)	<0.001
Amputation level				
Trans-tibial	2762 (60.3)	1045 (37.8)	1717 (62.2)	<0.001
Trans-femoral/hip disarticulation	1816 (39.7)	255 (14.0)	1561 (86.0)	
Etiologies				
Systemic sepsis, yes	516 (11.3)	104 (20.2)	412 (79.8)	<0.001
Systemic sepsis, no	4062 (88.7)	1196 (29.4)	2866 (70.6)	
Comorbidities				
Arrhythmias, yes	803 (17.5)	177 (22.0)	626 (78.0)	<0.001
Arrhythmias, no	3775 (82.5)	1123 (29.7)	2652 (70.3)	
Chronic pulmonary disease, yes	923 (20.2)	226 (24.5)	697 (75.5)	0.003
Chronic pulmonary disease, no	3655 (79.8)	1074 (29.4)	2581 (70.6)	
Congestive heart failure, yes	1094 (23.9)	242 (22.1)	852 (77.9)	<0.001
Congestive heart failure, no	3484 (76.1)	1058 (30.4)	2426 (69.6)	
Dementia, yes	340 (7.4)	29 (8.5)	311 (91.5)	<0.001
Dementia, no	4238 (92.6)	1271 (30.0)	2967 (70.0)	
Fluid and electrolyte disorders, yes	1020 (22.3)	230 (22.5)	790 (77.5)	<0.001
Fluid and electrolyte disorders, no	3558 (77.7)	1070 (30.1)	2488 (69.9)	
Liver disease, yes	164 (3.6)	56 (34.1)	108 (65.9)	0.096
Liver disease, no	4414 (96.4)	1244 (28.2)	3170 (71.8)	
Metastatic cancer, yes	61 (1.3)	11 (18.0)	50 (82.0)	0.071
Metastatic cancer, no	4517 (98.7)	1289 (28.5)	3228 (71.5)	
Pulmonary circulation disease, yes	39 (0.9)	10 (25.6)	29 (74.4)	0.702
Pulmonary circulation disease, no	4539 (99.1)	1290 (28.4)	3249 (71.6)	
Renal failure, yes	863 (18.9)	229 (26.5)	634 (73.5)	0.178
Renal failure, no	3715 (81.1)	1071 (28.8)	2644 (71.2)	
Stroke, yes	373 (8.1)	67 (18.0)	306 (82.0)	<0.001
Stroke, no	4205 (91.9)	1233 (29.3)	2972 (70.7)	
Treatment-level				
Acute procedure before surgery				
Severe renal disease, yes	218 (4.8)	42 (19.3)	176 (80.7)	0.002
Severe renal disease, no	4360 (95.2)	1258 (28.9)	3102 (71.1)	
ICU admission, yes	1256 (27.4)	277 (22.1)	979 (77.9)	<0.001
ICU admission, no	3322 (72.6)	1023 (30.8)	2299 (69.2)	
Other				

Variable	Total N (%)	Received prescription	Did not receive prescription	p-value
Year 1	2319 (50.7)	657 (28.3)	1662 (71.7)	0.921
Year 2	2259 (49.3)	643 (28.5)	1616 (71.5)	

Note: This table shows a frequency distribution of each variable by receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb. The following variables were removed from the table since they were not significant in the final model: gender, marital status, living location before hospitalization, patient residential setting, device infection, diabetes type I, diabetes type II, local significant infection, problems with peripheral circulation, skin breakdown, trauma, alcohol abuse, chronic blood loss anemia, coagulopathy, depression, drug abuse, other neurological disorders, paralysis, psychoses, visual impairment, weight loss, active pulmonary pathology, acute central nervous system, ongoing active cardiac pathology, serious nutritional compromise, length of stay from admission to surgery, hospital geographic setting, geographic region, and number of beds.

Table 3

Distribution of characteristics comparing those who died to those who remained alive for 3-years post-surgery

Variable	Total N (%)	Died N=2086	Alive N=2492	p-value
Receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb	1300 (28.4)	328 (25.2)	972 (74.8)	<0.001
No receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb	3278 (71.6)	1758 (53.6)	1520 (46.4)	
Patient-level				
Age in years, mean (SD)	66.9 (11.2)	69.7 (10.8)	64.6 (11.0)	<0.001
Amputation level				
Trans-tibial	2762 (60.3)	1097 (39.7)	1665 (60.3)	<0.001
Trans-femoral/hip disarticulation	1816 (39.7)	989 (54.5)	827 (45.5)	
Contributing etiologies				
Systemic sepsis, yes	516 (11.3)	299 (57.9)	217 (42.1)	<.0001
Systemic sepsis, no	4062 (88.7)	1787 (44.0)	2275 (56.0)	
Comorbidities				
Arrhythmias, yes	803 (17.5)	467 (58.2)	336 (41.8)	<0.001
Arrhythmias, no	3775 (82.5)	1619 (42.9)	2156 (57.1)	
Chronic pulmonary disease, yes	223 (4.9)	125 (56.1)	98 (43.9)	<0.001
Chronic pulmonary disease, no	3655 (79.8)	1576 (43.1)	2079 (56.9)	
Congestive heart failure, yes	223 (4.9)	125 (56.1)	98 (43.9)	0.001
Congestive heart failure, no	4355 (95.1)	1961 (45.0)	2394 (55.0)	
Dementia, yes	340 (7.4)	227 (66.8)	113 (33.2)	<0.001
Dementia, no	4238 (92.6)	1859 (43.9)	2379 (56.1)	
Fluid and electrolyte disorders, yes	1020 (22.3)	578 (56.7)	442 (43.3)	<0.001
Fluid and electrolyte disorders, no	4471 (97.7)	2053 (45.9)	2418 (54.1)	
Liver disease, yes	164 (3.6)	80 (48.8)	84 (51.2)	0.400
Liver disease, no	4414 (96.4)	2006 (45.4)	2408 (54.6)	
Metastatic cancer, yes	61 (1.3)	50 (82.0)	11 (18.0)	<0.001
Metastatic cancer, no	4517 (98.7)	2036 (45.1)	2481 (54.9)	
Pulmonary circulation disease, yes	39 (0.9)	26 (66.7)	13 (33.3)	0.008
Pulmonary circulation disease, no	4539 (99.1)	2060 (45.4)	2479 (54.6)	
Renal failure, yes	863 (18.9)	530 (61.4)	333 (38.6)	<0.001
Renal failure, no	3715 (81.1)	1556 (41.9)	2159 (58.1)	
Stroke, yes	373 (8.1)	215 (57.6)	158 (42.4)	<0.001
Stroke, no	4205 (91.9)	1871 (44.5)	2334 (55.5)	
Treatment-level				
Acute procedure before surgery				
Severe renal disease, yes	218 (4.8)	153 (70.2)	65 (29.8)	<0.001
Severe renal disease, no	4360 (95.2)	1933 (44.3)	2427 (55.7)	
ICU admission, yes	1256 (27.4)	688 (54.8)	568 (45.2)	<0.001

Variable	Total N (%)	Died N=2086	Alive N=2492	p-value
ICU admission, no	3322 (72.6)	1398 (42.1)	1924 (57.9)	
Other				
Year 1	2319 (50.7)	1095 (47.2)	1224 (52.8)	0.023
Year 2	2259 (49.3)	991 (43.9)	1268 (56.1)	

Note: This table shows a frequency distribution of each variable by three-year mortality post-surgery. The following variables were removed from the table since they were not significant in the final model: gender, marital status, living location before hospitalization, patient residential setting, device infection, diabetes type I, diabetes type II, local significant infection, problems with peripheral circulation, skin breakdown, trauma, alcohol abuse, chronic blood loss anemia, coagulopathy, depression, drug abuse, other neurological disorders, paralysis, psychoses, visual impairment, weight loss, active pulmonary pathology, acute central nervous system, ongoing active cardiac pathology, serious nutritional compromise, length of stay from admission to surgery, hospital geographic setting, geographic region, and number of beds.

Table 4

Clinically-based hypothesis-driven final model results

Variable	Hazard Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	p-value
Receipt of a prescription for a prosthetic limb	0.68	0.60-0.77	<0.001
Patient-level			
Age	1.03	1.02-1.03	<0.001
Amputation level (ref: trans-femoral/hip disarticulation)	1.33	1.21-1.46	<0.001
Contributing etiologies (ref: no)			
Systemic Sepsis	1.50	1.32-1.71	<0.001
Comorbidities (ref: no)			
Arrhythmias	1.13	1.01-1.26	0.030
Chronic pulmonary disease	1.23	1.11-1.36	0.001
Congestive heart failure	1.33	1.20-1.47	<0.001
Dementia	1.32	1.14-1.54	0.003
Fluid and electrolyte disorders	1.21	1.10-1.34	0.002
Liver disease	1.57	1.24-1.98	0.002
Metastatic cancer	2.86	2.15-3.82	<0.001
Pulmonary circulation disease	1.54	1.04-2.29	0.031
Renal failure	1.57	1.39-1.76	<0.001
Stroke	1.31	1.13-1.51	0.004
Valvular disease	1.34	1.12-1.60	0.001
Treatment-level			
Acute procedure before surgery			
Severe renal disease	1.67	1.38-2.01	<0.001
Intensive Care Unit admission	1.19	1.08-1.31	0.004
Other			
Year (ref: year 2)	1.20	1.09-1.31	0.001

Note: The following variables were included in the final model but removed from the table because they were insignificant: gender, marital status, living location before hospitalization, patient residential setting, device infection, diabetes type I, diabetes type II, local significant infection, problems with peripheral circulation, skin breakdown, trauma, alcohol abuse, chronic blood loss anemia, coagulopathy, depression, drug abuse, other neurological disorders, paralysis, psychoses, visual impairment, weight loss, active pulmonary pathology, acute central nervous system, ongoing active cardiac pathology, serious nutritional compromise, length of stay from admission to surgery, hospital geographic setting, geographic region, and number of beds.