



This is a repository copy of *Factors Associated With Ulcer Healing and Quality of Life in Patients With Diabetic Foot Ulcer*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/114483/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Spanos, K., Saleptsis, V., Athanasoulas, A. et al. (4 more authors) (2017) Factors Associated With Ulcer Healing and Quality of Life in Patients With Diabetic Foot Ulcer. *Angiology*, 68 (3). pp. 242-250. ISSN 0003-3197

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003319716651166>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Angiology

Factors associated with ulcer healing and quality of life in patients with diabetic foot ulcer.

Journal:	<i>Angiology</i>
Manuscript ID	ANG-16-02-089.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscripts
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Spanos, Konstantinos; University Hospital of Larisa, Vascular Surgery Saleptsis, Vasileios; University Hospital of Larissa, Vascular Surgery Athanasoulas, Athanasios; University Hospital of Larissa, Vascular Surgery Karathanos, Christos; University Hospital of Larissa, Vascular Surgery Bargiota, Alexandra; University Hospital of Larissa, Department of Endocrinology Chan, Phillip; Sheffield Vascular Institute Giannoukas, Athanasios; University Hospital of Larissa, University of Thessaly Medical School, Larissa, Greece, Department of Vascular Surgery;
Keywords:	Diabetic foot, ulcer, quality of life, limb loss

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **1 Factors associated with ulcer healing and quality of life in patients**
4
5
6 **2 with diabetic foot ulcer.**
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4 Konstantinos Spanos¹, MD, MSc, Vasileios Saleptsis¹, MD, MSc Athanasios
5 Athanasoulas¹, MD, MSc, Christos Karathanos¹, MD, MSc, PhD, Alexandra
6 Bargiota², MD, Philip Chan³, MChir, FRCS, Athanasios D Giannoukas¹, MD, MSc,
7 PhD, FEBVS.

8 Original Article

10 Department of Vascular Surgery¹, Department of Endocrinology², University Hospital of Larissa,
11 Faculty of Medicine, School of Health Sciences, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece.

12 Department of Vascular Surgery³, Sheffield Vascular Institute, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield,
13 United Kingdom.

14 Author for correspondence:

15 Konstantinos Spanos, MSc, MD, Department of Vascular Surgery, University Hospital of
16 Larissa, Faculty of Medicine, School of Health Sciences, University of Thessaly, Larissa,
17 Greece-mail: spanos.kon@gmail.com; Tel.: +306948570321; Fax: +30241350173
18 billsaleptsis2001@yahoo.gr, thanasis_ath@hotmail.com, christoskarathanos@yahoo.gr,
19 abargio@med.uth.gr, P.Chan@sheffield.ac.uk, agiannoukas@hotmail.com.

1
2
3 **Abstract:**
4

5
6 A prospective non-randomized cohort study on consecutive diabetic patients with foot
7
8 ulcer was undertaken, to assess factors associated with the healing process or limb
9
10 salvage, and evaluated the impact of their treatment on their quality of life (QOL).
11
12 QOL was evaluated using diabetic foot ulcer scale-short form questionnaire (DFS-SF)
13
14 before and after treatment. A total of 103 diabetic patients with ulcer (mean age
15
16 69.7±9.6 years, 77% male) were treated and followed up for 12 months. Ulcer
17
18 healing, minor amputation and major amputation rates were 41, 41 and 18%,
19
20 respectively while mortality rate was 18%. Ulcer healing was associated with
21
22 University of Texas wound grade I and the SIDESTEP trial's diabetic foot infection
23
24 wound score. Limb loss was associated with non-palpable popliteal artery, longer in-
25
26 hospital stay and delay until referral. QOL was improved in all domains of DFS-SF
27
28 (p<0.0001) throughout the cohort of our patients regardless of their outcome and no
29
30 outcome (healing, minor or major amputation) was superior to other. Significant
31
32 improvement was observed in all domains of hygiene self-management after
33
34 consultation during follow up period.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Key words:** Diabetic foot; ulcer; quality of life; limb loss.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Introduction

2 The International Diabetes Federation (IDF) reported that the global
3 prevalence of diabetes (DM) in adults was 8.3% in 2013 expecting to rise beyond 592
4 million by 2035 with a 10.1% global prevalence.¹ One of the most insidious
5 complications of DM is foot ulcer and according to the World Health Organization
6 (WHO), all foot complications may be encompassed under the term DFS (diabetic
7 foot syndrome) defined as “ulceration of the foot associated with neuropathy and
8 different grades of ischemia and infection.”² DFS was always a multinational burden
9 and in recognition of this reality the St. Vincent Declaration in 1989 included a set of
10 goals for the health care of people with DM.³ In response to the emerging pandemic of
11 DM type 2, after this declaration, several other regional partnerships between the IDF
12 and WHO, proceeded with their own declarations such as: the Declaration of the
13 Americas or DOTA (1996),⁴ the Western Pacific Declaration on Diabetes (WPDD
14 2000)⁵ and the Declaration and Diabetes Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa (2006).⁶

15 Various wound classification systems have been developed, so there will be a
16 common ‘language’ among the physicians and a helpful tool in the planning and
17 monitoring of treatment and in predicting the outcome of ulcer healing and assessing
18 the associated factors.^{7,8,9,10,11} Many practical guidelines have been published with
19 most recent one the evidence-based global consensus for the prevention and
20 management of diabetic foot by the International Working Group on the Diabetic
21 Foot (IWGDF) Editorial Board.¹²

22 Along with increased morbidity, foot ulcers can lead to lifelong disability and
23 may substantially diminish the quality of life (QOL) for these patients.¹³ Specifically,
24 patients with DFS have restrictions on mobility, poor psychosocial adjustment, and
25 lower self-perceptions of health than patients who do not have ulcers.^{13,14} An

1 understanding of the specific effects of DFS on individual patients' QOL is central to
2 the direction of treatment, adherence to treatment, and patient/practitioner
3 communication.

4 The aim of this observational study was primarily to assess the factors
5 associated with the healing process or limb salvage in diabetic patients with foot
6 ulceration. We also evaluated the impact of treatment and QOL outcomes.

8 **Methods**

9 A prospective non-randomized cohort study on consecutive diabetic patients
10 with foot ulceration was undertaken in a Mediterranean country (Central Greece, an
11 area with mainly agricultural production) by a tertiary centre which has the only
12 existing foot clinic service in the region. These were patients with DM type 2
13 suffering from lower limb ulceration who were referred to our service either at the
14 outpatient clinic or as an emergency. Exclusion criteria were: i) malnutrition (body
15 mass index: BMI < 18), ii) immobility (bed or wheel chair bound or stroke limb), iii)
16 immune-suppression, and, iv) lacking mental capacity to consent to the study.

17 The patients were under close follow up since their first assessment and had
18 regular appointments in the outpatient clinic of our service depending on their ulcer
19 healing progress. On the first visit, demographics (age, sex, height, weight, body mass
20 index-BMI) and personal details (residence address, occupation, carer identity) and
21 the past medical history, including duration of DM, history of hypertension (HT),
22 hyperlipidemia (HL), coronary artery disease (CAD), atrial fibrillation (AF),
23 peripheral artery disease (PAD), chronic kidney disease (CKD), chronic obstructive
24 pulmonary disease (COPD), cerebrovascular disease (CVD), ophthalmopathy, history

1 of smoking and alcohol, antiplatelet and statin therapy were recorded. Additionally,
2 family history of HT, HL and DM was also recorded.

3 In addition, all patients received clinical assessment by a Vascular Surgeon,
4 including palpation of the peripheral arteries, Ankle brachial index (ABI)
5 measurement, ulcer evaluation and a recording of self-management hygiene (self-
6 examination, foot washing, foot hydration, the way of cutting their nails, walking
7 barefoot and usage of special anatomical shoes). Ulcer evaluation was undertaken
8 according to three grading systems: i) the University of Texas wound classification
9 which is a system for diabetic foot wounds that evaluates wound depth, the presence
10 of infection, and peripheral arterial occlusive disease in every category of the wound
11 assessment,⁹ ii) the diabetic foot infection (DFI) wound score based on SIDESTEP
12 trial (Study of Infections in Diabetic feet comparing Efficacy, Safety and Tolerability
13 of Ertapenem versus Piperacillin/tazobactam) with the measurement of 10-items,¹⁰
14 and, iii) the Society for Vascular Surgery developed a Lower Extremity Threatened
15 Limb Classification System in which the risk stratification is based on 3 major factors
16 that impact amputation risk and clinical management such as wound, ischemia and
17 foot infection (WIFI).¹¹ The goal of all these systems is to improve communication,
18 leading to a less complex, more predictable treatment course and, ultimately, an
19 improved result.

20 Additionally, neuropathic pain (NP) was also assessed using LANSS (Leeds
21 Assessment of Neuropathic Symptoms and Signs) scale questionnaire.¹⁵ Patient
22 replies to the questions were a “yes or no” type and were evaluated differently
23 depending upon the question. For this purpose we used the Greek validated LANSS
24 questionnaire.¹⁶

1
2
3 1 Since this is an observational study, each Vascular Surgeon could decide on
4
5 2 the diagnostic investigations needed [foot X-Ray, Duplex scan, Computed
6
7 3 Tomography Angiography (CTA), Digital Subtraction Angiography (DSA)] and on
8
9 4 the type of treatment (open surgery, endovascular, hybrid procedures or conservative).
10
11 5 Primary outcomes were ulcer healing and minor or major amputation. Analysis of the
12
13 6 factors associated with the primary outcomes was undertaken. Secondary outcomes
14
15 7 were the impact in QOL after each type of treatment and self-management at 12-
16
17 8 month follow up.

18
19
20 9 A multidisciplinary approach program was established in our hospital
21
22 10 regarding these patients.

23
24
25 11 Regarding the assessment of patient QOL, we used the Greek version of
26
27 12 Diabetic Foot Ulcer scale- short form (DFS-SF) as translated by Mapi Research Trust-
28
29 13 All (Copyright © 2015 rights reserved).¹⁷ The DFS was developed to measure the
30
31 14 impact of diabetic foot ulcers on QOL issues most important to patients. The DFS was
32
33 15 also translated into several languages using both forward and backward translations
34
35 16 and cognitive debriefing to ensure cultural equivalence. The DFS contains a total of
36
37 17 64 items, 58 of which are used to compute 15 QOL subscales.¹⁸ The 6 remaining
38
39 18 items address employment-related issues and are not included in computation of
40
41 19 subscale scores on the DFS long form.

42
43
44
45 20 The final version of the DFS-SF (short-form)¹⁷ which is used broadly contains
46
47 21 a total of 29 items grouped into six subscales:

- 48
49 22 - Leisure (5 items)
50
51 23 - Physical health (5 items)
52
53 24 - Dependence/daily life (5 items)
54
55 25 - Negative emotions and worried about ulcers/feet (10 items)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 - Bothered by ulcer care (4 items)
4

5 Thus, each patient had to fill the DFS-SF questionnaire during the first
6
7 examination, and after 12 months of follow up. Also, the QOL was analyzed in
8
9 respect to the ulcer treatment, the patient's residence and the level of their home care.
10
11 Additionally, Visual Analogue Scales for the impact of pain on daily living activities
12
13 of (VAS-ADL) (0–10) and a 10 cm visual analog scale for the pain intensity (VAS-
14
15 INT) (0, no pain; 10, unbearable pain)¹⁵ were recorded at their first visit to the
16
17 outpatient clinic and their last one.
18
19

20
21 This study involved the collection of existing data and diagnostic tests that
22
23 have been recorded in such a manner that subjects could not be identified, either
24
25 directly or through identifiers linked to the subject. However, the protocol and
26
27 informed consent were approved by the Institutional Review Board.
28
29

30
31

32 **Statistical analysis**

33
34 The relationships of categorical variables and the main outcomes observed
35
36 (ulcer healing, minor amputation, major amputation, mortality) was examined with
37
38 the use of the Chi Square statistic, while the relationships between main outcomes and
39
40 continuous measurements was assessed with the independent samples t-test or the
41
42 Mann Whitney test, where appropriate. The findings were assessed and the
43
44 statistically significant variables were entered in a binary logistic regression model.
45
46 The two way interaction effects were also considered to reach the final model for each
47
48 outcome. For the change in the Quality of life Measures the Paired samples t-test was
49
50 applied for each of the dimensions measured. Statistical significance was set at 0.05
51
52 (two-sided). The analysis was carried out with the use of SPSS v.21.0
53
54
55

56
57
58
59
60

1 Results

2 Over a period of 2 years (2012-2014) 103 consecutive patients with diabetic
3 foot ulcer entered into the study and were followed up for 12 months. Only 2 patients
4 were already excluded due to the exclusion criteria. The mean age of the patients was
5 69.7 ± 9.6 years and most of them were males (76.7%, 79/103). More than half of the
6 patients were manual workers and almost everyone was cared for by family members.
7 The population was overweight with mean BMI of 28. Most of the patients were on
8 antiplatelet (80%) and statin (70%) therapy, while half of them were also on insulin.
9 Social-demographics, past-medical history details and blood test results are presented
10 in table 1.

11 Almost half of the patients (47%, 49/103) presented directly to our hospital as
12 an emergency, while 20% (21/103) were referred by an endocrinologist, 11.5%
13 (11/103) by a general surgeon, 11.5% by a general practitioner (GP), 3.8% (4/103) by
14 another vascular surgeon, 3% (3/103) by an internal medicine physician, 2% (2/103)
15 by a nephrologist, 1% (1/103) by a neurologist and 1% (1/103) by an orthopedic
16 department. The mean time until referral to our service was 23.8 ± 9 days. There was
17 no difference between patients with self-referral and physician referral. However,
18 there was a seasonal variation in the presentation and referral of these patients to our
19 service peaking in colder months during the year (autumn and winter, 64%, 66/103 vs
20 spring and summer 36%, 37/103, $p < 0.05$). The most common cause of ulcer was
21 trauma (lack of attention 68%, 70/103; shoe wearing trauma 11.7% ,12/103); after
22 great saphenous harvesting 2% (2/103); after nail cutting 1% (1/103); and 17.5%
23 (18/103) by unknown cause. The ulcers were confined mainly to toes (64%, 66/103),
24 and less frequently to the shin (9.7%, 10/103), the sole (7.8%, 8/103), the heel (7.8%,

1
2
3 8/103), the dorsal surface of the foot (5.8%, 6/103), the ankle (2.9%, 3/103) and in a
4
5 2 previous amputation stump area (1.9%, 2/103) (Figure 1).
6

7 In table 2 patients are categorized according to the University of Texas wound
8
9 classification system (i) and according to the Lower Extremity Threatened Limb
10
11 Classification System (WIFI) (ii). Additionally, the mean DIF wound score was
12
13 20.4±3, while the mean LANSS score was 20.5±3.4 (all patients in our study had
14
15 LANSS score > 12).
16
17

18 During 12 month of follow up, 41% (42/103) of the patients had their ulcer
19
20 healed. From this group, 40.5% (17/42) of the patients were healed in the first month,
21
22 85.7% (36/42) in first 3 months and 97.6% (41/42) in first 6 months. A further 50.5%
23
24 (52/103) of the patients underwent a minor amputation, 63% (33/52) of which during
25
26 first hospitalization, 88.5% (46/52) during first 3 months and 98% (51/52) during first
27
28 6 months after initial presentation. All but 9 patients achieved healing of their minor
29
30 foot amputation. These 9 patients along with another 9 underwent major amputation
31
32 accounting for a 17.6% (18/103) limb loss. Most of the amputations (14/18, 77%)
33
34 were undertaken in first 6 months.
35
36
37

38 After multiple logistic regression analysis including characteristics of tables,
39
40 referral characteristics and ulcer location and causes, ulcer healing was associated
41
42 with University of Texas wound classification and DIF wound score. Patients with
43
44 TEXAS grade I ulcer had 23-fold more often ulcer healed (95% CI 2.3-220, p=0.007)
45
46 than those with a higher grade. Additionally, after increase of one DIF score unit, the
47
48 odds risk for ulcer non-healing is increased by 15% (95% CI 1.5-30%, p=0.028), with
49
50 mean DIF score 17±2 for ulcer healed patients and 24.5±3 for non-healed patients.
51
52 23 (Figure 2)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 Minor amputation was associated with Texas classification, COPD and
4
5 2 LANSS score. Patients with TEXAS grade II or higher had 11.3 increased odds risk
6
7 3 for minor amputation (95% CI 3.4-38, $p<0.001$) than those with grade I. Additionally,
8
9 4 patients with COPD had 12.3 increased odds risk for minor amputation (95% CI 2.1-
10
11 5 73 $p=0.006$), while for every increase of one unit of LANSS score the odds risk for
12
13 6 minor amputation is increased by 43% (95% CI 2-100%, $p=0.040$). (Figure 3)

16 7 Major amputation was associated with palpable pulses of popliteal artery,
17
18 8 hospital stay and time until referral. Every patient with non-palpable popliteal artery
19
20 9 had 5.2 increased odds risk for major amputation (95% CI 1.03-26 $p=0.045$). For each
21
22 10 additional hospital stay the odds risk for a major amputation increased by 8% (95% CI
23
24 11 2-14% $p=0.007$). Finally, for each additional day of delay until referral the odds risk
25
26 12 for major amputation increased by 3.5% (95% CI 1-6% $p=0.011$).

29 13 Among patients with evidence of ischemia requiring revascularization, no
30
31 14 differences were observed in respect to healing rate, minor and major amputation
32
33 15 according to the type of intervention; 36 patients underwent 38 procedures: 20
34
35 16 endovascular only, 9 open only and 9 hybrid ones and the total healing rate was
36
37 17 30.5% (11/36). In patients who were not considered candidates for revascularization
38
39 18 (67/103), a reasonable healing rate was observed (46%, 31/67).

42 19 Lack of multidisciplinary assessment was observed in a large number of
43
44 20 patients and therefore during their initial hospitalization they were referred for
45
46 21 evaluation to other services: 65 (63%) patients to Endocrinology for DM control, 34
47
48 22 (33%) to Cardiology, 8 (7.7%) to Nephrology, 8 (7.7%) to Ophthalmology, 6 (5.8) to
49
50 23 Orthopedics, 4 (3.8) to a Chest Medicine and 1 (1%) to Neurology.

53 24 The mortality rate was 17.5% (18/103) during the 12 month period.
54
55 25 Myocardial infraction (MI) accounted for the majority of deaths (72%, 13/18), while 3
56
57
58
59
60

1 patients died because of severe sepsis and 1 due to acute renal failure. After
2 multivariate analysis only age was associated with death. For each one additional year
3 of age, the risk of death was increased by 17% (95% CI 7 -29% p=0.001). During 12-
4 month follow up no patient had a development of a new ulcer or a deterioration of a
5 healed one.

6 All alive in 12 month-follow up patients completed the QOL questionnaire
7 (DFS-SF) in their first and the last assessment (12-month follow up); 82.5% (85/103)
8 were available for QOL assessment at 12-month follow up. QOL was significantly
9 improved in all domains of DFS-SF ($p<0.0001$) throughout the cohort of our patients
10 after their treatment as compared with their condition before treatment. (Table 4) In
11 addition, after further analysis, it appeared that the improvement of QOL was not
12 associated with the type of treatment and the outcome, thus there was no difference in
13 improvement of QOL among patients regardless of whether they had their ulcer
14 healed or had undergone an amputation. The lower improvement in QOL was
15 demonstrated in domains related to physical health (mean increase 9.9), dependency
16 in daily life (mean increase 10.9), treatment satisfaction (mean increase 12.4) and
17 higher improvement in domains related to leisure (mean increase 16.5) and negative
18 emotions (mean increase 18.2). Finally, when QOL was analyzed according to the
19 patient residency area and the caring person, no correlation was identified. A
20 significant improvement was observed in all domains of hygiene self-management
21 between the first and the last assessment (12 months) of follow up while VAS of both
22 types were improved significantly during follow up.(Table 3)

24 Discussion

1 In our study, the mean duration of DM among patients was 18 ± 3 years.
2
3 However, it was demonstrated that their actual awareness about the nature of the
4 disease was inadequate. Thus, 50% of our patients presented to our service late from
5 the onset of the ulcer (mean time 24 days), with a poorly controlled DM (mean
6 Hb1AC: 8.1% and BMI: 28) and low awareness of hygiene self-management (table
7 3). It has been previously demonstrated that foot self-care is generally infrequent, and
8 clinical monitoring in outpatient clinics is performed for less than half of diabetic
9 patients with foot ulcers.¹⁹ In practice, patient education aiming to promote foot care
10 knowledge and self-examination is advocated by most experts and guidelines as an
11 important strategy to prevent diabetic foot complications. Education of patients at
12 high risk of or with ulceration is considered to be particularly important.²⁰ In some
13 trials, foot care knowledge and self reported patient behavior seem to be positively
14 influenced by education in the short term.²¹ In our study after many consultations of
15 our patients during follow up, they managed to improve their hygiene self-
16 management status considerably (Table 3), decreasing the likelihood of a new ulcer.
17 However, the effect of patient education is still in doubt and there is insufficient
18 robust evidence that limited patient education alone is effective in achieving clinically
19 relevant reductions in ulcer and amputation incidence.²¹ Additionally, in our study,
20 almost half of the patients had a late referral by their physician, and thus it would
21 seem advisable to implement strategies oriented towards the improvement of primary
22 care physician awareness of diabetic foot and its complications, along the IWGDF
23 recommendations that healthcare professionals should receive periodic education to
24 improve the care of high-risk individuals.¹² It is true that such patients may neglect
25 themselves because of various reasons including impaired sensation due to
neuropathy, impaired vision as a result of retinopathy, and other co-morbidities

1
2
3 including cardiac and renal impairment which all may contribute also to the lack of a
4
5 personal alarm system.^{22,23}
6

7
8 It is still debatable whether ulcer healing in diabetic patient always requires
9
10 revascularization. Although, in a recent systematic review, it was demonstrated that
11
12 improved rates of limb salvage were associated with revascularization compared with
13
14 the outcomes of conservatively only treated patients, there were insufficient data to
15
16 recommend one method of revascularization over another.²⁴ Along this line, in our
17
18 study, no differences were observed in respect to healing rate, minor and major
19
20 amputation according to the type of intervention. However, this was an observational
21
22 study and not designed to compare those treatments. Over the last decade, there has
23
24 been a marked shift from open revascularization to an endovascular one in diabetic
25
26 patients with foot ulcer²⁵ and in some centers endovascular treatment is used first as
27
28 "preliminary approach" for critical limb ischemia and diabetic foot.²⁶ Additionally, in
29
30 patients who were not considered candidates for revascularization, a reasonable
31
32 healing rate was observed (46%, 31/67). Recently, it was suggested that even diabetic
33
34 patients with ischemic foot ulcers not available for revascularization, should not be
35
36 excluded from healing without major amputation.²⁷
37
38
39

40
41 The SIDESTEP trial has demonstrated that the clinical response was less
42
43 favorable at the follow-up assessment in patients with a DIF score >19.¹⁰ Along this
44
45 line, our study showed that patients with healed ulcer had a score of mean value 16.8
46
47 (figure 2). Another important factor that was associated with ulcer healing was the
48
49 TEXAS classification during first examination. Thus, it seems that initial clinical
50
51 evaluation with the use of DIF score and TEXAS classification may help physicians
52
53 to identify which patients are at increased risk for non-healing ulcers or even limb
54
55 loss, and in whom closer follow up and more aggressive treatment may be indicated.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 As far as the predictive factors associated with limb loss are concerned, it has
4
5 2 been previously demonstrated that male gender and the presence of neuropathy,²⁸
6
7 3 Severity of Diabetic Foot Infection,²⁹ elevated fasting blood sugar,³⁰ WBC and
8
9 4 PAD,³¹ are associated with amputations. In our study, Texas classification, COPD and
10
11 5 LANSS score were associated with minor and delay of hospital referral, the severity
12
13 6 of PAD, and the prolonged hospitalization were associated with major amputation. It
14
15 7 seems that detailed initial clinical assessment and fast-track management of DFS are
16
17 8 important factors associated with limb loss. Furthermore, it is of note that the majority
18
19 9 of deaths in our cohort were cardiac related. This underlines the importance of
20
21 10 cardiovascular disease risk factor control as primary prevention in patients with DM 2
22
23 11 as it has been recommended from the American Heart Association and the American
24
25 12 Diabetes Association.³²

26
27
28
29 13 The evaluation of the patient QOL has been recognized as an important area of
30
31 14 scientific knowledge, since the concept of QOL has been related to the notion of
32
33 15 health: satisfaction and well-being in the physical, psychological, socio-economic and
34
35 16 cultural spheres.³³ According to the WHO, QOL can be defined as an individuals'
36
37 17 perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in
38
39 18 which they live in and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and
40
41 19 concerns.³⁴ Studies have evaluated and reported on QOL in diabetic patients with
42
43 20 ulcer and compared them with other control groups.^{13,34-38} Presence or history of
44
45 21 diabetic foot ulceration has been proved to have a large impact on physical
46
47 22 functioning and mobility.³⁸ Diabetic foot ulcer patients had much worse health related
48
49 23 QOL (HRQL) compared with the diabetes population and the general population,
50
51 24 especially in physical health.^{13,36-38} Our study is the first to our knowledge that
52
53 25 evaluates the QOL in the same group of patients before and after treatment. Thus, in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 our study the presence of diabetic foot ulcer was associated with poor QOL, and QOL
4
5 2 was significantly improved in all domains of throughout the cohort of our patients
6
7 3 after the ulcer management. However, it was interesting, that QOL was improved
8
9
10 4 regardless of patient outcome (healing, minor or major amputation) and no outcome
11
12 5 was superior to another. Similarly, VASs were improved after treatment in our cohort.
13
14 6 Even in cases that a major amputation was undertaken, the patients perceived their
15
16 7 situation as improved in terms of QOL. A recent report was in agreement with that
17
18 8 outcome, suggesting that clinicians should not assume that patients will experience
19
20 9 poorer QOL outcome only because they underwent an amputation.³⁴ An
21
22 10 understanding of the specific effects of chronic diabetic foot ulcers on individual
23
24 11 patient QOL is central to the direction of treatment, management of compliance, and
25
26 12 patient/practitioner communication.
27
28

29
30 13 Patients with a diabetic foot ulcer should to be assessed holistically, thus
31
32 14 intrinsic and extrinsic factors should be addressed and managed by a multidisciplinary
33
34 15 diabetic foot team (MDFT) of physicians as soon as possible (within one working day
35
36 16 of presentation or even immediately in the presence of severe infection).^{12,39,40}
37
38 17 However, in many hospitals not only in our country, but also in the Mediterranean
39
40 18 region,⁴¹ a MDFT approach has not been adopted and physicians have to work as
41
42 19 individuals on diagnosis and management and attempt to refer patients to other
43
44 20 specialties when they consider that it is necessary. Studies, have demonstrated that the
45
46 21 introduction of a MDFT has been associated with a reduction in the incidence of
47
48 22 major amputations in patients with DM.^{42,43}
49
50

51
52 23 Potential selection and treatment biases may exist as about 50% of patients
53
54 24 had PAD, because this study was a prospective observational one, in patients referred
55
56 25 to the Vascular Service of a tertiary Hospital. However, this reflects the real world
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 practice of a Vascular Service which inevitably is committed to deal with more
4
5 2 difficult-to-heal ulcers.
6
7 3
8
9 4
10

11 **Conclusions**

12
13
14 Our observational study showed that delayed hospital referral, prolonged
15
16
17 7 hospitalization and absence of popliteal pulses were associated with limb loss.
18
19 8 Additionally, initial clinical status assessment with DIF score and TEXAS
20
21 9 classification may predict ulcer healing. QOL improved in all patients after treatment
22
23 10 regardless of the outcome (healing or amputation). Also, improvement was observed
24
25 11 in the hygiene self-management.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **No conflict of interest.**

33 Author contribution

34
35
36
37 15 All authors contributed to: (1) substantial contributions to conception and design, or
38
39 16 acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, (2) drafting the article or
40
41 17 revising it critically for important intellectual content, and, (3) final approval of the
42
43 18 version to be published.
44
45
46
47
48

49 **References**

- 50
51 21 1. International Diabetes Federation. IDF Diabetes Atlas. 6th ed. Brussels,
52
53 22 Belgium: International Diabetes Federation. 2013
54
55 23 2. Jeffcoate WJ, Macfarlane RM, Fletcher EM. The description and classification
56
57 24 of diabetic foot lesions. *Diabet Med.* 1993; 10 (7): 676-679.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 3. The Saint Vincent Declaration on diabetes care and research in Europe. *Acta*
4
5 2 *Diabetologica*. 1989; 10 (Suppl): 143-144.
- 6
7 3 4. The Declaration of the Americas or DOTA. *Diabetes Voice*. 2001; 46 (2): 47.
- 8
9
10 4 5. The Western Pacific Declaration on Diabetes (WPDD 2000).
11
12 5 <http://www2.wpro.who.int/wpdd/> (last accessed 12.02.16)
- 13
14
15 6 6. Declaration and Diabetes Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa (2006).
16
17 7 <http://www.diabetesethiopia.org.et/diabetesdeclaration.pdf> (last accessed
18
19 8 12.02.16)
- 20
21
22 9
23
24
25 10 7. Frykberg RG. Diabetic foot ulcers: pathogenesis and management. *Am Fam*
26
27 11 *Physician*. 2002; 66 (9): 1655-1662.
- 28
29
30 12 8. Oyibo SO, Jude EB, Tarawneh I, Nguyen HC, Harkless LB, Boulton AJ. A
31
32 13 comparison of two diabetic foot ulcer classification systems. *Diabetes Care*.
33
34 14 2001; 24 (1): 84-88.
- 35
36 15 9. Lavery LA, Armstrong DG, Harkless LB. Classification of diabetic foot
37
38 16 wounds. *J Foot Ankle Surg*. 1996; 35 (6): 528-531.
- 39
40
41 17 10. Lipsky BA, Polis AB, Lantz KC, Norquist JM, Abramson MA. The value of a
42
43 18 wound score for diabetic foot infections in predicting treatment outcome: a
44
45 19 prospective analysis from the SIDESTEP trial. *Wound Repair Regen*. 2009; 17
46
47 20 (5): 671-677.
- 48
49
50 21 11. Mills JL Sr, Conte MS, Armstrong DG et al.
51
52 22 Society for Vascular Surgery Lower Extremity Guidelines
53
54 23 Committee. The Society for Vascular Surgery Lower Extremity Threatened Li
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 mb Classification System: risk stratification based on wound, ischemia,
4 and foot infection (WIFI). *J Vasc Surg.* 2014; 59 (1): 220-234.
5
6 2
7 3 12. Bakker K, Apelqvist J, Lipsky BA, Van Netten JJ, Schaper NC; International
8 Working Group on the Diabetic Foot (IWGDF). The 2015 IWGDF guidance
9 documents on prevention and management of foot problems in diabetes:
10 development of an evidence-based global consensus. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev.*
11 2016; 32 Suppl 1: 2-6.
12
13 4 13. Brod M. Quality of life issues in patients with diabetes and lower extremity
14 ulcers: patients and caregivers. *Qual Life Res.* 1998; 7 (4): 365-372.
15
16 5 14. Carrington AL, Mawdsley SK, Morley M, Kincey J, Boulton AJ.
17 Psychological status of diabetic people with or without lower limb disability.
18 *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 1996; 32 (1-2): 19-25.
19
20 6 15. Bennett M. The LANSS Pain Scale: the Leeds assessment of neuropathic
21 symptoms and signs. *Pain.* 2001 May; 92 (1-2): 147-157.
22
23 7 16. Spanos K, Lachanas VA, Chan P, Bargiota A, Giannoukas AD. Validation of
24 the Leeds Assessment of Neuropathic Symptoms and Signs (LANSS)
25 questionnaire and its correlation with visual analog pain scales in Greek
26 population. *J Diabetes Complications.* 2015; 29 (8): 1142-1145.
27
28 8 17. Bann CM, Fehnel SE, Gagnon DD. Development and Validation of the
29 Diabetic Foot Ulcer Scale–Short Form (DFS-SF). *Pharmacoeconomics.* 2003;
30 21 (17): 1277-1290.
31
32 9 18. Abetz L, Sutton M, Brady L, McNulty P, Gagnon DD. The Diabetic Foot
33 Ulcer Scale (DFS): a quality of life instrument for use in clinical trials.
34 *Practical Diabetes Int.* 2002; 19 (6): 167-175.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 19. Al Sayah F, Soprovich A, Qiu W, Edwards AL, Johnson JA.
4
5 2 Diabetic Foot Disease, Self-Care and Clinical Monitoring in Adults with
6
7 3 Type 2 Diabetes: the Alberta's Caring for Diabetes (ABCD) Cohort Study.
8
9 4 *Can J Diabetes*. 2015; 39 Suppl 3:S 120-126.
10
11 20. Morey-Vargas OL, Smith SA. BE SMART: Strategies for foot care and
12
13 6 prevention of foot complications in patients with diabetes. *Prosthet Orthot Int*.
14
15 7 2015; 39 (1): 48-60.
16
17 21. Dorresteijn JA, Kriegsman DM, Assendelft WJ, Valk GD. Patient education
18
19 9 for preventing diabetic foot ulceration. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014
20
21 10 Dec 16;12:CD001488.
22
23 22. Kishore S, Upadhyay AD, V P J. Awareness of foot care among patients with
24
25 11 diabetes attending a tertiary care hospital. *Natl Med J India* 2015; 28 (3): 122-
26
27 12 125.
28
29 23. Lamchahab FZ, El Kihal N, Khoudri I, Chraibi A, Hassam B, Ait Ourhroui M.
30
31 13 Factors influencing the awareness of diabetic foot risks. *Ann Phys Rehabil*
32
33 14 *Med*. 2011; 54 (6): 359-365.
34
35 24. Hinchliffe RJ, Brownrigg JR, Andros G et al.; International Working Group
36
37 15 on the Diabetic Foot (IWGDF). Effectiveness of revascularisation of the
38
39 16 ulcerated foot in patients with diabetes and peripheral artery disease: a
40
41 17 systematic review. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev*. 2016; 32 Suppl 1: 136-134.
42
43 25. Skrepnek GH, Armstrong DG, Mills JL. Open bypass and endovascular
44
45 18 procedures among diabetic foot ulcer cases in the United States from 2001 to
46
47 19 2010. *J Vasc Surg*. 2014; 60 (5): 1255-1264.
48
49 20
50 21
51 22
52 23
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 26. Setacci C, Sirignano P, Galzerano G et al. Endovascular first as "preliminary
4 approach" for critical limb ischemia and diabetic foot. *J Cardiovasc Surg*
5
6 2 *(Torino)*. 2013; 54 (6): 679-684.
7
8 3
9
10 4 27. Elgzryi T, Larsson J, Thörne J, Eriksson KF, Apelqvist J.
11 Outcome of ischemic foot ulcer in diabetic patients who had
12
13 5
14 6 no invasive vascular intervention. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2013; 46 (1):
15
16 7
17 110-117.
18
19 8 28. Moura Neto A, Zantut-Wittmann DE, Fernandes TD, Nery M, Parisi MC. Risk
20 factors for ulceration and amputation in diabetic foot: study in a cohort of 496
21
22 9
23 10 patients. *Endocrine*. 2013; 44 (1): 119-124.
24
25 11 29. Wukich DK, Hobizal KB, Brooks MM. Severity of diabetic foot infection and
26 rate of limb salvage. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2013; 34 (3): 351-358.
27
28 12
29 13 30. Namgoong S, Jung S, Han SK, Jeong SH, Dhong ES, Kim WK. Risk
30 factors for major amputation in hospitalised diabetic foot patients. *Int Wound*
31
32 14
33 *J*. 2016;13 Suppl 1:13-19.
34
35 15
36 16 31. Aziz Z, Lin WK, Nather A, Huak CY. Predictive factors for lower
37 extremity amputations in diabetic foot infections. *Diabet Foot Ankle*. 2011; 2.
38
39 17
40 18 doi: 10.3402/dfa.v2i0.7463.
41
42 19 32. Fox CS, Golden SH, Anderson C, Bray GA, Burke LE, de Boer IH. American
43
44 20
45 Heart Association Diabetes Committee of the Council on Lifestyle and
46
47 21
48 Cardiometabolic Health, Council on Clinical Cardiology, Council
49
50 22
51 on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing, Council on Cardiovascular Surgery
52
53 23
54 24 and Anesthesia, Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research, and the
55
56 25
57 American Diabetes Association. Update on Prevention of Cardiovascular
58
59
60 Disease in Adults With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Light of Recent Evidence:

- 1
2
3 1 A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association and
4
5 2 the American Diabetes Association. *Circulation*. 2015; 132 (8): 691-718.
6
7 33. Orley J, Kuyken W, editors. World Health Organization. WHOQOL Group.
8
9 4 The development of the World Health Organization quality of life assessment
10
11 5 instrument (the WHOQOL). In: *Quality of life assessment: international*
12
13 6 *perspectives*. Heigelberg: Springer Verlag. 1994: 41-60.
14
15
16 7 34. McDonald S, Sharpe L, Blaszczyński A. The psychosocial impact associated
17
18 8 with diabetes-related amputation. *Diabet Med*. 2014; 31 (11): 1424-1430.
19
20
21 9 35. Valensi P, Girod I, Baron F, Moreau-Defarges T, Guillon P. Quality of life
22
23 10 and clinical correlates in patients with diabetic foot ulcers. *Diabetes Metab*.
24
25 11 2005; 31: 263-271.
26
27
28 12 36. Meijer JW, Trip J, Jaegers SM et al. Quality of life in patients with diabetic
29
30 13 foot ulcer. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2001; 23 (8): 336-340.
31
32
33 14 37. Ribu L, Hanestad BR, Moum T, Birkeland K, Rustoen T. A comparison of the
34
35 15 health-related quality of life in patients with diabetic foot ulcers, with a
36
37 16 diabetes group and a nondiabetes group from the general population. *Qual Life*
38
39 17 *Res*. 2007;16 (2): 179-189.
40
41
42 18 38. Siersma V, Thorsen H, Holstein PE et al.. Health-
43
44 19 related quality of life predicts major amputation and death, but not healing, in
45
46 20 people with diabetes presenting with foot ulcers: the Eurodiale study.
47
48 21 *Diabetes Care*. 2014; 37 (3): 694-700.
49
50
51 22 39. TRIEPodD-UK. Podiatry competency framework for integrated diabetic foot
52
53 23 care — a user's guide. London: *TRIEpodD-UK*, 2012.
54
55
56 24 40. Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network. Management of diabetes. A
57
58 25 national clinical guideline. Guideline no 116. Edinburgh: SIGN,
59
60

1
2
3 1 2010. Available at: <http://www.sign.ac.uk/guidelines/fulltext/116/index.html>.
4
5 2 (last accessed 12.12.2015).
6

7 3 41. Spanos K, Lachanas V, Karathanos C, Poredos P, Hussein E, Giannoukas AD.
8

9
10 4 A survey on the status of the management of diabetic foot in the
11
12 5 Mediterranean region. *Int Angiol*. 2015 Feb 13. [Epub ahead of print]
13

14 6 42. Rubio JA, Aragón-Sánchez J, Jiménez S et al. Reducing major lower
15
16 7 extremity amputations after the introduction of a multidisciplinary team for
17
18 8 the diabetic foot. *Int J Low Extrem Wounds*. 2014; 13 (1): 22-26.
19

20 9 43. Martínez-Gómez DA, Moreno-Carrillo MA, Campillo-Soto A, Carrillo-García
21
22 10 A, Aguayo-Albasini JL. Reduction in diabetic amputations over 15 years in a
23
24 11 defined Spain population. Benefits of a critical pathway approach
25
26 12 and multidisciplinary team work. *Rev Esp Quimioter*. 2014; 27 (3): 170-179.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Socio-Demographics		Past medical history		Blood test	
Sex	76.7% Males (79/103)	Type of Diabetes	100% Type 2		Mean±SD
Age in years	69.7±9.63	Mean duration of DM in years	17.7±7.9	Hb	11.9±1.7g/dL
Mean height in cm	164.7±24.4	HT	93.2% (96/103)	WBC	13±3 10 ³ /μL
Mean weight in kg	79.23±16.7	CAD	55.3% (57/103)	Neu	72.8±9.5%
Mean BMI in kg/m ²	28±5.1	AF	12.6% (13/103)	PLT	277±111 10 ³ /μL
Residency		PAD	53.4% (55/103)	MPV	8.6±1.2 fL
Urban	53.4% (55/103)	Mean ABI R	0.9±0.3	ESR	36.8±20.3mm/h
Countryside	46.6% (48/103)	Mean ABI L	0.7±0.2	CRP	4.9±2.4mg/dL
Occupation		Patients with non-compressible ABI	29% (30/103)	Cr	1.0±0.3mg/dL
White collar worker	25.2% (26/103)	DSA	38.8% (40/103)	Ur	45±26mg/dL
Manual worker	54.4% (56/103)	CTA	2% (2/103)	Na	137.2±14mmol/L
Unemployed	20.4% (21/103)	CRD	20.4% (21/103)	K	4.6±1.2mmol/L
Home carer		HL	74.8% (77/103)	ALT	24±24 IU/L
Spouse	46.6% (48/103)	COPD	11.7% (12/103)	AST	28±25 IU/L
Descendants	47.6% (49/103)	CVD	12.6% (13/103)	CK	106±97U/L
Alone	5.8% (6/103)	History of alcohol consumption	23.3% (24/103)	LDH	202±92IU/L
Family history of DM	44.6% (46/103)	History of smoking		Bilirubin	0.5±0.3mg/dL
Family history of PAD	15.5% (16/103)	No	27.2% (28/103)	Total Chol	167±52mg/dL
Family history of CAD	76.7% (79/103)	Yes	25.2% (26/103)	Trig	168±73mg/dL
		Ex smoker	47.6% (49/103)	LDL	111±49mg/dL
		History of ophthalmopathy		HDL	42±14mg/dL
		None	25.2% (26/103)	INR	1±0.3
		Mild	42.7% (44/103)	APTT	32.3±6sec
		Moderate	22.3% (23/103)	PT	18.2±5sec
		Severe	9.7% (10/103)	HbA1C	8.1±1.2%
				Negative ulcer cultures	63% (65/103)

1
2
3
4
5 Table 1. Social-demographics, past-medical history details and blood test results of
6
7 each patient.
8

9
10 BMI: body mass index; DM: diabetes mellitus; PAD: peripheral artery disease; CAD:
11
12 coronary artery disease; HT: hypertension; AF: atrial fibrillation; ABI: ankle brachial
13
14 index; DSA: digital subtraction angiography; CTA: computed tomography
15
16 angiography; CRD: chronic renal disease; HL: hyperlipidemia; COPD: chronic
17
18 obstructive pulmonary disease; CVD: cerebrovascular disease; Hb: hemoglobin;
19
20 WBC: white blood cells; Neu: neutrophils; PLT: platelets; MPV: mean platelet
21
22 volume; ESR: erythrocyte sedimentation rate; CRP: C-reactive protein; Cr:
23
24 creatinine; Ur: Urea; Na: sodium; K: potassium; ALT: alanine transaminase; AST:
25
26 aspartate transaminase; CK: creatine kinase; LDH: lactate dehydrogenase; Chol:
27
28 cholesterol; Trig: triglycerides; LDL: low-density lipoprotein; HDL: high-density
29
30 lipoprotein; INR: international normalized ratio; APTT: activated partial
31
32 thromboplastin time; PT: prothrombin time; HbA1C: hemoglobin A1C; cm:
33
34 centimeter; kg: kilogram; m: meter; μ l: microlitre; fl: femtolitre; mm: millimeter; h:
35
36 hour; IU: International Units; L: Litre; mmol: millimole; U: units; dL: deciliter; sec:
37
38 second.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

i.

Stage	Grade			
	0	I	II	III
A	0	3	0	0
B	0	28	16	3
C	0	30	10	
D	0	8	4	1

ii.

	Ischemia 0				Ischemia 1				Ischemia 2				Ischemia 3			
W0																
W1	1	14			6	1			2	15	4		2	12		
W2		2	5	2		3				1	2			1	1	
W3				1							1					
	F0	F1	F2	F3	F0	F1	F2	F3	F0	F1	F2	F3	F0	F1	F2	F3

Table 2. i. Patients categorized according to Texas Wound Classification system.⁶

ii. Patients categorized according to Wound Ischemia Foot infection Classification system,⁸ (W: wound; F: foot infection).

Self-management				
First examination		After 12 month of follow up		
Mean Self-examination per week	1.84	Mean Self-examination per week	8.4	p< 0.05
Mean Foot washing per week	3.9	Mean Foot washing per week	7.8	p< 0.05
Mean foot hydration per week	0.66	Mean foot hydration per week	7	p< 0.05
Cutting nails		Cutting nails		
Him/herself	64% (66/103)	Him/herself	11.6% (12/103)	p< 0.05
Other	34% (35/103)	Other	70.9% (73/103)	p< 0.05
Specialist	2% (2/103)	Specialist	17.4% (18/103)	p< 0.05
Sock selection	11.6% (12/103)	Sock selection	79.6% (82/103)	p< 0.05
Special anatomical shoes		Special anatomical shoes		
No	92.2% (95/103)	No	80% (83/103)	ns
Walking barefoot:		Walking barefoot:		
Yes	42.7% (44/103)	Yes	7.6% (8/103)	p< 0.05
Visual analog scales				
Mean VAS ADL	6.8±2.5	Mean VAS ADL	4.2±1.2	p< 0.05
Mean VAS INT	6.3±2.2	Mean VAS INT	2.8±1.3	p< 0.05

Table 3. Hygiene self-management assessment between the first and the last examination (12 months) of follow up. A 10 cm visual analogue scale for the impact of pain on daily living activities of (VAS-ADL) (0–10) and a 10 cm visual analog scale for the pain intensity (VAS-INT) (0, no pain; 10, unbearable pain. ns: not significant.

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	P values
Pair 1	Leisure after 12-month follow up	45,8796	21,04544	2,02510	,000
	Leisure at 1st examination	29,0741	16,74643	1,61143	
Pair 2	Physical health after 12-month follow up	45,3704	19,55944	1,88211	,000
	Physical health at 1st examination	35,3704	17,23536	1,65847	
Pair 3	Daily activities after 12-month follow up	46,4815	21,16092	2,03621	,000
	Daily activities at 1st examination	35,3704	19,39149	1,86595	
Pair 4	Emotions after 12-month follow up	40,4861	21,45539	2,06455	,000
	Emotions at 1st examination	22,7083	16,58004	1,59542	
Pair 5	Treatment after 12-month follow up	45,1968	22,32484	2,14821	,000
	Treatment at 1st examination	33,1019	18,05081	1,73694	

Table 4. Quality of life assessment in all domains at baseline (1st examination) and at 12-month follow up.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Schematic location of the ulcers.

review




Figure 2. After increase of one DIF score unit, the risk for ulcer non-healing is increased by 15% (95% CI 1.5% – 30%, $p=0.028$), with mean DIF score 17 ± 2 for ulcer healed patients and 24.5 ± 3 for non-healed patients. (DIF: diabetic foot infection; CI: confidence interval).




Figure 3. For every increase of one unit of LANSS score the risk for minor amputation is increased by 43% (95% CI 2% – 100%, $p=0,040$). (LANSS: Leeds Assessment of Neuropathic Symptoms and Signs, CI: confidence interval)