

**ERRATUM**

Vol. 11 (2018) No. 3 pp. 398–426

2015 JAPAN Critical Limb Ischemia Database (JCLIMB) Annual Report

The Japanese Society for Vascular Surgery JCLIMB Committee, NCD JCLIMB Analytical Team

In the above secondary publication article, a formula error was found after the publication, which affected numerical data in the main text and tables. The erratum of the original Japanese article was published in Japanese Journal of Vascular Surgery Vol. 28 (2019) No. 4. The same corrections and the corrected version of tables are given below.

p. 400, Left, ll. 20–24

Incorrect:

Therefore, in JCLIMB, the SPP value was converted to TP using the conversion equation  $TP = 0.6853 \text{ SPP} + 14.48$  from the correlation data of SPP and TP reported in Japan,<sup>8)</sup> and applied for WIfI ischemic grading (Table 1-2-2).

Correct:

Therefore, in JCLIMB, the SPP value was converted to TP using the conversion equation  $SPP = 0.6853 \text{ TP} + 14.48$  from the correlation data of SPP and TP reported in Japan,<sup>8)</sup> and applied for WIfI ischemic grading (Table 1-2-2).

p. 400, Right, ll. 3–6

Incorrect:

On the WIfI classification, limbs with the stages 1, 2, 3, and 4 accounted for 10%, 23%, 26% (27%), and 40% (41%) of the limbs, respectively.

Correct:

On the WIfI classification, limbs with the stages 1, 2, 3, and 4 accounted for 19%, 18%, 29%, and 44% of the limbs, respectively.

p. 400, Right, ll. 23–29

Incorrect:

In Table 3-6, 81 limbs (77 limbs) were registered as Ischemic grade 0 in WIfI classification. By definition, a limb with Ischemic grade 0 has a TP of 60 mmHg or more (SPP 66 mmHg or more in JCLIMB) or AP higher than 100 mmHg, or if arterial calcification precludes reliable AP or TP measurements, TcPO<sub>2</sub> 60 mmHg, or more (Table 1-1-2).

Correct:

In Table 3-6, 89 limbs (85 limbs) were registered as Ischemic grade 0 in WIfI classification. By definition, a limb with Ischemic grade 0 has a TP of 60 mmHg or more (SPP 56 mmHg or more in JCLIMB) or AP higher than 100 mmHg, or if arterial calcification precludes reliable AP or TP measurements, TcPO<sub>2</sub> 60 mmHg, or more (Table 1-1-2).



©2019 The Editorial Committee of Annals of Vascular Diseases. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the credit of the original work, a link to the license, and indication of any change are properly given, and the original work is not used for commercial purposes. Remixed or transformed contributions must be distributed under the same license as the original.

p. 407, Table 1-2-2

Incorrect:

**Table 1-2** SVS Wifl classification: Correlation of Wifl and items in JCLIMB

**Table 1-2-2** Ischemia

Grade	SPP: (mmHg; calculating from the formula*)
0	≥66
1	37–65
2	23–36
3	<23

\*TP=0.6853×SPP+14.48

SPP: skin perfusion pressure, TP: toe pressure

Correct:

**Table 1-2** SVS Wifl classification: Correlation of Wifl and items in JCLIMB

**Table 1-2-2** Ischemia

Grade	SPP: (mmHg; calculating from the formula*)
0	≥56
1	42–55
2	35–41
3	<35

\*SPP=0.6853×TP+14.48

SPP: skin perfusion pressure, TP: toe pressure

p. 415, Table 3-6

Incorrect:

**Table 3** Pretreatment condition

**Table 3-6** SVS Wifl classification

	a. Total															
	Wound				Ischemia				Foot infection				Stage			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
Rutherford 4	241	0	0	0	16	31	46	63	217	10	11	3	44	103	7	2
Rutherford 5	0	263	351	113	52	107	173	257	478	161	71	17	42	93	204	250
Rutherford 6	0	10	43	117	13	19	30	52	50	30	74	16	2	3	14	95
Total	241	273	394	230	81	157	249	372	745	201	156	36	88	199	225	347

  

	b. ASO															
	Wound				Ischemia				Foot infection				Stage			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
Rutherford 4	236	0	0	0	16	31	44	60	213	9	11	3	44	99	6	2
Rutherford 5	0	257	343	110	48	106	170	253	465	160	70	15	40	89	203	245
Rutherford 6	0	10	43	115	13	19	29	52	50	30	72	16	2	3	14	94
Total	236	267	386	225	77	156	243	365	728	199	153	34	86	191	223	341

Correct:

**Table 3** Pretreatment condition  
**Table 3-6** SVS Wifl classification

a. Total																
	Wound				Ischemia				Foot infection				Stage			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
Rutherford 4	241	0	0	0	<u>16</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>85</u>	217	10	11	3	<u>41</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>
Rutherford 5	0	263	351	113	<u>59</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>383</u>	478	161	71	17	<u>38</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>223</u>	<u>279</u>
Rutherford 6	0	10	43	117	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>77</u>	50	30	74	16	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>95</u>
Total	241	273	394	230	<u>89</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>545</u>	745	201	156	36	<u>81</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>246</u>	<u>376</u>

  

b. ASO																
	Wound				Ischemia				Foot infection				Stage			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	4
Rutherford 4	236	0	0	0	<u>16</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>81</u>	213	9	11	3	<u>41</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>
Rutherford 5	0	257	343	110	<u>55</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>379</u>	465	160	70	15	<u>36</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>274</u>
Rutherford 6	0	10	43	115	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>76</u>	50	30	72	16	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>94</u>
Total	236	267	386	225	<u>85</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>536</u>	728	199	153	34	<u>79</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>244</u>	<u>370</u>