BRIEF REPORT

Economic Factors and Longevity in Spinal Cord Injury: A Reappraisal

David Strauss, PhD, Michael DeVivo, DrPH, Robert Shavelle, PhD, Jordan Brooks, BS, David Paculdo, MPH

ABSTRACT. Strauss D, DeVivo M, Shavelle R, Brooks J, Paculdo D. Economic factors and longevity in spinal cord injury: a reappraisal. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89:572-4.

Objective: To review and reassess the findings of Krause and colleagues on the effect of economic and other risk factors on life expectancy after spinal cord injury, using an expanded and updated database.

Design: Pooled person-year analysis.

Setting: Model Spinal Cord Injury Systems hospitals.

Participants: A total of 7331 persons injured since 1973 who were enrolled in the National Spinal Cord Injury Database and received an evaluation between November 1995 and December 2005.

Interventions: Not applicable.

Main Outcome Measures: Mortality, determined by routine follow-up supplemented by information from the Social Security Death Index. Logistic regression models based on the predictor variables were developed to estimate the chance of dying in a given year.

Results: As in the Krause study, life expectancies of persons with the greatest handicap in economic self-sufficiency were substantially shorter than average. However, the positive effect of favorable economics was much less than previously reported, largely because having health insurance coverage through workers' compensation was no longer a powerful (or statistically significant) predictor of survival.

Conclusions: The beneficial effect of favorable economics appears to be much less than previously reported. Further, the interpretation of the effects of modifiable factors (such as economics and social integration) is complicated by questions of cause and effect.

Key Words: Economics; Life expectancy; Rehabilitation; Risk factors; Spinal cord injuries.

© 2008 by the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine and the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

THERE IS CONSIDERABLE literature on life expectancy after spinal cord injury (SCI) that takes account of demographic factors: age, sex, level and grade of injury, ethnicity, etc.[1-3] A recent article by Krause et al[4] went beyond this by considering other factors such as health, community integration, and economic indices. Such work may be significant in showing how potentially modifiable factors relate to longevity.

Krause considered a series of 4 models for predicting mortality, and hence life expectancy. The first included only demographic factors, whereas the fourth included the health, integration, and economic factors that contributed significantly to prediction. Krause illustrated the results with the example of a 25-year-old man with a complete C6 injury. A striking finding was that whereas model 3 (which included everything except economic factors) gave an estimate of 68% of normal life expectancy, the assumption of "favorable economics" in model 4 resulted in an increase of 13 percentage points, to 81% of normal. Favorable economics here meant (1) a net family income (after out-of-pocket SCI expenses) of 150% or more of the poverty level, and (2) health insurance coverage through workers' compensation rather than through Medicare, Medicaid, private insurance, or other means.

We have recently been able to update and expand the database used in this study by adding more patients and increasing the length of follow-up of original patients. We then re-examined the findings. In the present report, we summarize the new findings and comment briefly on their interpretation. We focus on economic factors because this aspect of the Krause study seems to have been the mostly widely cited.

METHODS

Participants and Data

The data were drawn from the U.S. Model Spinal Cord Injury Systems database, maintained by Michael DeVivo, DrPH, at the University of Alabama. Subjects were 7331 persons with SCI enrolled in the database who were alive and received an evaluation between November 1995 and December 2005; 744 subjects died by the end of the study follow-up period (December 2005).

Information on the subjects' health, social, and economic status was taken from the first post-1995 evaluation with complete data. It was not possible to update the subjects' scores on health, economics, etc, during the 1995 to 2005 study period.

The economic variable available to Krause and to us is based on an index of handicap from the Craig Hospital Assessment Reporting Technique (CHART).[5] This is computed from:

$$\frac{\text{total family income} - \text{unreimbursed medical expenses}}{\text{poverty level}}$$

The poverty level, which varies with family size, is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau and updated periodically. The economic handicap score is equal to 50 times this ratio, with

a maximum of 100 and a minimum of 0. Thus, persons with a ratio of 2 or more have a score of 100. Because the variable is a measure of *handicap*, and a ratio of 2 is considered to be "no handicap," no distinction is made between ratios of 2 and higher ratios. Thus the data contain no information about the effect of having *extensive* economic resources rather than being merely at twice the poverty level.

Outcome Measures and Data Analysis

The unit of analysis was a person-year. Thus a subject who received an evaluation at, say, the end of 1998 contributed a person-year for 1999, a person-year for 2000, and so on until death or the end of the study period.

Each person-year was associated with a binary outcome variable and a set of explanatory variables. The outcome variable was whether the subject lived or died during that 12-month period. The explanatory variables included age, sex, ethnicity, level and grade of injury, together with health, social, and economic variables (see below). The purpose of the analysis was to relate the outcome variable, mortality in a given year, to the various explanatory variables.

We used the same methods as Krause et al,[4] with 1 exception: the proportional life expectancy method[6] was used to estimate mortality rates at ages over 75.

RESULTS

Among the study population of 7331 persons, there were 41,440 person-years of follow-up and 744 deaths. The average follow-up time was 5.1 years.

In the earlier study, workers' compensation was associated with a dramatic reduction in mortality (odds ratio [OR]=.43; 95% confidence interval [CI], .25−.73), other factors being equal. However, the effect was somewhat unstable due to the number of patients with workers' compensation. In the updated database, this factor had a much smaller effect (OR=.80; 95% CI, 0.59−1.10). Although this still suggests a beneficial effect, it is no longer statistically significant ($P>.15$). We therefore excluded it from our final revised analyses of the effects of income on life expectancy.

We applied regression methods to the economic handicap score to explore the possibility of constructing a linear (or other) scale based on the handicap score that would allow extrapolation to incomes exceeding twice the poverty level (ie, scores of 100 on the handicap scale). We found, however, that the mortality associated with scores of 100 was substantially greater than would be predicted from a linear regression fitted to scores less than 100. After further analysis, it appeared that the most appropriate use of the economic variable was that used by Krause, namely, a simple 3-point scale of scores of 0 to 50, 51 to 75, and 75 to 100. We therefore followed Krause by basing "favorable economics" on this scale.

The new estimates of the percentage of general population life expectancy for a 25-year-old white man with a C6 level American Spinal Injury Associate grade A injury who has already survived at least 1 year postinjury are:

- Model 3 (good health and community integration but not taking account of economic sufficiency): 63%
- Model 4 (as above, plus most favorable economic category): 66%
- Model 4 (as above with most unfavorable economic category): 55%

Thus being in the most favorable economic category, rather than being "average," is associated with an increase of only 3 percentage points of general population life expectancy rather than with 13 points as in the previous study. However, being in the least favorable group (which corresponds to a net income at or below the poverty level) is markedly worse than being average. A similar pattern was observed for persons of age 50. Overall, the new data revealed slightly less favorable survival rates than were found in the original study, which continued the trend reported in 1999.[3]

DISCUSSION

Our analysis confirms the finding in Krause that those with the most severe handicap were subject to mortality well in excess of the average. It appears, however, that the positive effect of favorable economics on life expectancy of persons with SCI is less than previously estimated.[4] This is not surprising when one notes that the CHART economic self-sufficiency variable is only designed to measure economic handicap, and we are thus merely comparing persons in the most unfavorable economic category with those with an "average" handicap. The data available both to Krause and to us does not distinguish adjusted family incomes that are twice the poverty level from much higher net incomes, and thus it is not possible at present to comment on the effect of having unusually good economic resources.

Issues of cause and effect complicate the interpretation of these findings, and further research will be needed to disentangle the independent effects of these factors. For example, it cannot be assumed that the shorter life expectancy for those in the worst economic group solely reflects inadequate funding for care needs. It is conceivable that such persons are less likely to be compliant with medical advice, or more likely to have adverse health habits such as smoking or drug use. On the other hand, the effect of the economic factor may have been diluted in model 4 because the health and community integration factors that were controlled for may to some extent reflect the effects of favorable economics.

Study Limitations

One limitation of the data set is that ideally the variables should be updated for each current year rather than be assumed constant over the subject's time in the study period. For example, the answer to "Is your health this year worse than it was last year?" will surely change over the years. However, this is a practical limitation imposed by the available data: most subjects contribute only 1 or 2 interviews over the study period. It seems unlikely that this issue has had a major effect on the results.

CONCLUSIONS

The study of potentially modifiable risk factors for mortality in SCI is valuable. Our research provides further support for the very plausible hypothesis that those near the poverty level have shorter life expectancies than others. However, the study provides no evidence for or against the proposition that those with large net incomes have better life expectancies than persons with adequate, though more modest, resources. In addition, although economic, social, and health factors are statistically associated with survival, further research will be required to establish the causal relationships between these factors.

References

1. DeVivo MJ, Stover SL. Long-term survival and causes of death. In: Stover SL, DeLisa JA, Whiteneck GG, editors. Spinal cord injury: clinical outcomes from the model systems. Gaithersburg: Aspen; 1995. p 289-316.
2. DeVivo MJ, Kartus PL, Stover SL, Rutt RD, Fine PR. Seven-year survival following spinal cord injury. Arch Neurol 1987;44:872-5.
3. DeVivo MJ, Krause JS, Lammertse DP. Recent trends in mortality and causes of death among persons with spinal cord injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1999;80:1411-9.
4. Krause JS, DeVivo MJ, Jackson AB. Health status, community integration, and economic risk factors for mortality after spinal cord injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2004;85:1764-73.
5. Whiteneck GG, Charlifue SW, Gerhart KA, Overhosler JD, Richardson GN. Quantifying handicap: a new measure of long-term rehabilitation outcomes. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1992;73: 519-26.
6. Strauss DJ, Vachon PJ, Shavelle RM. Estimation of future mortality rates and life expectancy in chronic medical conditions. J Insur Med 2005;37:20-34.