Responsiveness of the foot and ankle ability measure (FAAM) in individuals with diabetes
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ABSTRACT

Background: The impact of diabetes on physical function pose a challenge in assessing clinical outcomes. Objective: The purpose of this study was to provide evidence of responsiveness for the foot and ankle ability measures (FAAM) in individuals with diabetes mellitus. Methods: The two most recent FAAM scores of 155 diabetic patients treated for foot/ankle pathology were analyzed. Based on physical component summary (PCS) scores of the SF-36, subjects were categorized as improved (>7-point positive change), worsened (>7-point negative change), or unchanged (<7-point change). Analyses of the worsened and improved groups were compared to the unchanged group using two-way repeated measures ANOVAs and ROC curve analyses. Results: The ANOVAs demonstrated a significant difference between groups (P = 0.001). ROC curves analysis for detecting an improvement or decline in status were 0.73 (95% CI 0.62–0.84) and 0.70 (95% CI 0.59–0.81), respectively. An increase in FAAM score of 9 points represented the minimal clinically important difference (MCID) with 0.64 sensitivity and 0.78 specificity. A decrease in FAAM score of 2 points represented a MCID with 0.65 sensitivity and 0.61 specificity. Conclusions: The FAAM demonstrated responsiveness to change in individuals with orthopedic foot and ankle dysfunction complicated by diabetes and can be used to measure patient outcomes over a 6-month period.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Diabetes mellitus (DM) affects 23.6 million Americans with 1.6 million new cases diagnosed each year [1]. Based on the incidence of DM in the general population, we expect that nearly one in twelve patients will have diabetes [1]. The impact of DM can affect multiple dimensions of physical, social, and psychological function. Specifically, DM can cause severe and debilitating conditions of the foot and ankle including ulcers, infections, and amputations [2–4]. The prevalence of DM and its impact on physical function can pose a challenge in assessing meaningful clinical outcomes. This is particularly true in patients with foot and ankle involvement complicated by diabetic neuropathy. This study aimed to assess the responsiveness of the foot and ankle ability measure (FAAM) outcome instrument for use among individuals with DM.

Several disease-specific instruments exist to assess patients with DM [5–19]. However, disease-specific instruments may not comprehensively address the functional impact of foot and ankle impairment. Thus an instrument that can be used to assess foot and ankle function in patients with DM is needed. The FAAM is an instrument developed to measure region-specific function of the foot and ankle. It is comprised of two individually scored subscales; a 21-item activities of daily living and 8-item sports subscale [20]. It is easy for patients to complete and uncomplicated for clinicians to calculate. The FAAM was developed with use of the item response theory and has undergone advanced psychometric testing that provides evidence of reliability, validity, and responsiveness in a general orthopedic population [20]. Recently, the ADL sub-scale of the FAAM has demonstrated evidence for validity among patients with foot and ankle dysfunction and co-existing DM [21].

Additional psychometric testing is needed to determine if the FAAM is responsive to changes in physical function of the foot and ankle in a diabetic population. The purpose of this study was to assess responsiveness of the FAAM in patients with DM. Responsiveness was assessed at the group and individual level. It was...
hypothesized that a change in FAAM scores in the groups that either improved or worsened would be greater than the group that did not change. At the individual level, it was hypothesized that ROC curves would offer statistical evidence that the FAAM was responsive to change in physical function. From this analysis the respective minimal clinically important difference (MCID) values that represent meaningful improvement and meaningful decline in functional status were determined.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Subjects

Subjects consisted of patients being seen by an orthopedic surgeon for a routine clinic visit for pathology related to their foot and ankle. Inclusion criteria included having the diagnosis of DM with FAAM and Short Form-36 (SF-36) scores available. Exclusion criteria included those who were unable to read and understand English. One hundred and fifty-five subjects were included in the study. These subjects had a mean age of 59 years (range 18–80, SD = 10) with 63% females and 47% males. Subjects averaged a duration of 17 years (SD = 14) of DM. Description of the diagnoses, the presence of neuropathy, insulin dependence, and surgical status of the subjects is reported in Table 1.

2.2. Data collection

Subjects prospectively completed the FAAM activities of daily living subscale and SF-36 during each visit. Scores from the two most recent office visits (T1 and T2) were chosen for analysis. Changes in the physical component score (PCS) of the SF-36 score were calculated. Studies have shown that a 7-point change in PCS represents a significant change in status and was used as the criterion for change [22]. Subjects who had at least a 7-point increase or decrease in PCS were, respectively, categorized as improved or worsened. Those with less than a 7-point PCS change were categorized as unchanged.

2.3. Data analysis

Evaluation of responsiveness requires comparison of a group that has changed to a group that has not changed. Thus a separate analysis of responsiveness should be determined for the group that improved as well as the group that worsened. This yields an assessment of responsiveness specific to the direction of change in the patient’s score. Assessment of responsiveness was done at the group and individual level. Group level assessment of responsiveness was done with two separate two-way repeated measure ANOVAs. One analysis was done to compare change in FAAM scores in the group that demonstrated improvement compared to the group which did not change. A separate analysis was done to compare the group that demonstrated a decline of the PCS score beyond 7 points compared to those who did not change. The a priori alpha level for this analysis was set at 0.05. Statistical analysis was performed with SPSS 17.0 (Chicago, IL) statistical software package.

An assessment of responsiveness was done at the individual level using ROC curves. Similar to the group level analysis, two separate ROC curves and respective sensitivity and specificity values were calculated to determine the ability of the FAAM to be responsive to an improvement as well as a decline in physical status. A 95% confidence interval (CI) for the area under the ROC curve that does not contain 0.5 is indicative of responsiveness to change in physical function. Each ROC curve analysis determined a MCID value with the greatest sensitivity and specificity to identify meaningful change. The MCID values provide the criterion specific to the direction of change to determine if interventions have resulted in respective improvement or decline of function [23].

3. Results

Using a 7-point change on the PCS as the criterion for change, 34 (22%) subjects improved, 38 (25%) worsened, and 84 (53%) were unchanged. Mean FAAM scores for the groups that improved, worsened, and were unchanged at T1 and T2 are present in Table 1. The average change in the FAAM score between T1 and T2 for the group that improved was 17.0 (range 15–60 SD 19.0). The average change in FAAM scores between T1 and T2 for the group that remained unchanged was 3.3 (range: 35–56 SD 19.3). The average change in FAAM score between T1 and T2 for the group that worsened was −6.4 (range = 37–38 SD 15.3). The group by time interaction was significant when comparing the improved and unchanged groups (F(1, 115) = 12.73 P = 0.001) and comparing the worsened and unchanged groups(F(1, 119) = 21.63 P < 0.0005). The areas under the ROC curve for detecting an improvement or decline in status were 0.73 (95% CI 0.62–0.84) and 0.70 (95% CI 0.59–0.81), respectively. The 95% CI for the areas under the ROC curves did not contain 0.5, indicating the FAAM was responsive to a change in status. An increase in FAAM score of 9 points represented a MCID with 0.65 sensitivity and specificity values, respectively. A decrease in FAAM score of 2 points represented a MCID with 0.64 and 0.78 sensitivity and specificity values, respectively.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Percentage of patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polyaarthropathy</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthropathy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulcer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle fracture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatarsal fracture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia-Fibula fracture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteomyelitis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellulitis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pes planus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deformity of the toe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantar fasciitis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoporosis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteochondrosis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amputation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle instability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle sprain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin dependent</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic complications</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical status</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-surgical</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in status</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>39.7 (range 1–75 SD 21.8)</td>
<td>56.7 (range 23–84 SD 18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsened</td>
<td>44.8 (range 10–83 SD 19.3)</td>
<td>38.4 (range 0–74 SD 19.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>45.1 (range 1–84 SD 19.5)</td>
<td>48.5 (range 0–84 SD 28.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subjects may have more than one diagnosis.*
4. Discussion

The results of this study offer evidence for the responsiveness of the FAAM in detecting change in function among patients with orthopedic foot and ankle pathology complicated by DM over a 6-month time frame. The responsiveness of the instrument was demonstrated on both the group and individual levels. At the group level, the instrument demonstrated a significant group by time interaction in 2-way repeated measures ANOVA that was consistent with our original hypothesis. Evidence of responsiveness at the individual level was demonstrated by the results of the ROC. As hypothesized, the area under the curve did not contain 0.5, indicating that the FAAM had the ability to detect a change at an individual level. These results build on existing evidence of the psychometric properties of the FAAM and offer additional evidence for use in detecting changes of physical function among orthopedic patients with complicating DM.

Given the prevalence of foot and ankle dysfunction among patients with DM, it is important to establish tools that have evidence of responsiveness to changes in physical function. This allows confidence that a change in status is the result of an actual change rather than an error of the outcome measure [24]. Evidence for psychometric characteristics may only be established in the context and population in which it has been evaluated [21]. Patients with DM being treated for foot and ankle conditions may experience different complaints than non-diabetic patients. Notably, patients with DM commonly have complicating neuropathy that may limit their complaints of pain. Other region-specific measures of the foot and ankle focus heavily on components of pain [25–29]. For instance, nearly 40% of Foot Function Index [26] score and over 21% of the Foot and Ankle Outcome score [29] is determined by pain. Patients with DM may not experience pain, but still may experience significant impairment to ADL function.

The FAAM specifically assesses the functional abilities of the patient, matching the components that may be of greatest interest to a diabetic population. By establishing evidence for responsiveness in the context of an orthopedic population of patients with DM, the instrument increases its usability for a greater range of patients. It also demonstrates evidence of responsiveness over a clinically relevant period of time. A 6-month interval represents a reasonable time-frame in which patients treated for foot and ankle impairments may be re-evaluated by their orthopedic surgeon. The FAAM is the only region-specific instrument that has established evidence of psychometric properties with content specific to the complaints of patients with DM. The results of this study support utilization of the FAAM among patients with primarily orthopedic foot and ankle dysfunction complicated by DM. However, further study is required to support its use under various conditions as the process of evaluating the usefulness of an instrument is a continual and ongoing process. Current studies are underway to evaluate the test re-test reliability and responsiveness over differing lengths of follow-up.

There are multiple statistical expressions that may provide evidence of responsiveness of an instrument [30,31]. Of particular importance is to determine the smallest change in score that can be considered a meaningful change, known as the MCID [32]. Most studies that report MCID values examine the response to an intervention with the expectation that the patient will demonstrate improvement. Thus, only the MCID value representing a positive change in status may be explored [33]. It may be equally useful to establish a MCID value to note when a decline in status has occurred. This is particularly true in the study of patients with progressive diseases, such as DM, where a decline in function may be anticipated. Therefore, an instrument utilized to assess outcomes would ideally detect meaningful improvement as well as a decline in function [33]. In our study, the patients that improved and the patients that worsened were individually compared to an unchanged group of patients to determine MCID values specific to the direction of change. This allowed interpretation of the changes in scores for patients that have demonstrated improvement as well as those who worsened according to their PCS scores. The bidirectional analysis of MCID values is recommended but seldom performed [33]. Brunner et al. [34] studied the bidirectional responsiveness of disease specific activity measures on patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Their results indicated that a relatively small change in activity measures resulted in a meaningful change in status of both the patients who improved and the patients who worsened. However, the magnitude of the MCID values for each direction is not always equal [33]. Hays and Woolley [32] reference a general health perceptions scale that demonstrated an MCID value of 13 points to determine a meaningful change of improvement, while a 34-point regression was necessary to signify deterioration. This illustrates the disparity that may exist in MCID values of improvement versus worsening and further emphasizes the need for bidirectional analysis [32,33]. The results of our analysis indicate that a 9-point improvement in FAAM’s ADL subscale is necessary to demonstrate a clinically meaningful improvement.

This is very similar to the findings by Martin et al. [20] indicating an 8-point MCID value among patients in a general orthopedic population. A 2-point regression represented a significant decline in self-reported function. Thus a patient with DM and foot/ankle complaints who has an initial FAAM score of 60 would need to improve to a score of 69 or greater at their 6-month follow-up appointment to be considered to have experienced a significant improvement of physical function. Alternately, the patient’s score would need to decrease to 58 or lower to be considered to have a significant decline of function. The individual analysis of responsiveness allows clinical interpretation of individual FAAM scores among the target population that is specific to the direction of the change.

Ceiling and floor effects may limit usefulness of an instrument and negatively influence responsiveness. Ceiling effects occur when patients score very high on the instrument and have no room to demonstrate a change in status. Floor effects occur as the scores from the patients are very low and the items of the instrument are too advanced to capture the level of ability of the patient [35]. According to Martin et al. [21], the ADL subscale did not exhibit evidence of floor or ceiling effects. However, a significant floor effect was noted for the sports subscale scores. Thus the subscale may be too advanced to demonstrate change in an ADL subscale study as the highest FAAM score was an 85 and less than 5% scored less than 10. While this study demonstrates the responsiveness of the FAAM, limitations of the study must be recognized. First, the FAAM is a region-specific instrument designed to capture disability of the foot and ankle as reported by the patient. The FAAM does not contain items that are specific to DM nor does it contain observable measures of impairment. Therefore the role of the FAAM in a diabetic population may best be served as a compliment to disease-specific instruments and/or objective physical exam findings to offer the most complete representation of a clinical outcome. The methods of analysis may also serve as a limitation to the study. There are several additional ways to analyze responsiveness including mean differences, effect size, reliable change index, and responsiveness index [36]. Different methods may yield different interpretations [32]. We chose repeated ANOVAs and establishment of MCID values through ROC analysis to assess responsiveness. Utilizing two separate methods of analysis is recommended to allow corroboration of the results and strengthen the credibility of the findings [33,37]. An additional concern is related to the criterion used to estab-
lish groupings of patients who improved, worsened, or remained unchanged. Many studies utilize global change scores that may lack validity and reliability to determine perceived improvement of the patient [37]. We attempted to minimize this concern by utilizing a well-established scale (PCS of the SF-36) that has an established strong relationship to the FAAM [20] and has an ability to demonstrate change in patients with DM [22]. A 7-point change in status of the PCS represents two standard errors of measurement and has been previously established as the value to determine a significant change in status among patients with chronic diseases including DM [22,38].

5. Conclusions

The results provide evidence that the FAAM is responsive to change in physical function of the foot and ankle in individuals with diabetes. It is the first region-specific instrument to establish evidence of psychometric properties of the FAAM among patients being treated for orthopedic foot and ankle problems with complicating DM.
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