

Minimising deconditioning in acute care

A/Prof Gideon Caplan Prince of Wales Hospital Sydney Australia

A true geriatric syndrome

- "\$\u03c6 muscle tone, endurance or function due to ac. or chr. disease, immobility and hospitalisation."
- Multifactorial
 - Illness
 - Treatment
 - General effects of hospitalisation
- Multi-system
- Frequent: 1/3 2/3 older patients
- Multiple adverse outcomes
- Often devastating



Overlaps

- Delirium
- Dementia
- Sarcopenia
- Frailty



Hoogerduijn JG. J Clin	Nursing 2007; 16: 46-57
Non-modifiable	Potentially modifiable
Age	Length of stay
ADL disability	Depression
IADL disability	Bedrest
Cognitive Impairment/ Dementia	Delirium
Cancer	Decubitus ulcer
	Low social activity

Dick factors





Outcomes of deconditioning

- \downarrow ADL and cognitive function
- Need for rehabilitation/ \uparrow LOS
- \uparrow Community services
- Placement
- Death

Interventions

- 1. Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment
- 2. Exercise
- 3. Nutritional supplements
- 4. Hospital in the Home
- 5. Intensive Care

Effect of CGA on ADLs

Ellis G. CGA for older adults. Cochrane 2011; 7: Art No.: CD006211

Study or subgroup	Treatment		Control		Std. Mean Difference	Weight	Std. Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	N	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Ward							
Applegate 1990	78	1.1 (1.9)	77	0.64 (2.3)	*	12.7 %	0.22 [-0.10, 0.53]
Harris 1991	97	11.5 (4.9)	170	11 (5.2)	+	20.3 %	0.10 [-0.15, 0.35]
Nikolaus 1999 plus ESD	181	91.8 (<mark>14.4</mark>)	92	91.1 (15.9)		20.0 %	0.05 [-0.20, 0.30]
Nikolaus 1999 Ward	179	92.6 (14.3)	93	91.1 (<mark>1</mark> 5.9)	+	20.1 %	0.10 [-0.15, 0.35]
Subtotal (95% CI)	535		432		•	73.1 %	0.11 [-0.03, 0.24]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.70$,	df = 3 (P = 0.8	87); I ² =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = I$.57 (P = 0.12)						
2 Team							
Thomas 1993	68	14.3 (3.5)	64	14 (3)	+	10.8 %	0.09 [-0.25, 0.43]
Winograd 1993	99	3.6 (2)	98	4 (2.1)	-	16.1 %	-0.19 [-0.47, 0.09]
Subtotal (95% CI)	167		162		•	26.9 %	-0.08 [-0.30, 0.14]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1.61$,	df = 1 (P = 0.2)	20); 1 ² =38%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.72 (P = 0.47)						
Total (95% CI)	702		594		•	100.0 %	0.06 [-0.06, 0.17]
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.35,	df = 5 (P = 0.5)	50); l ² =0.0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.97 (P = 0.33)						
Test for subgroup difference	s: $Chi^2 = 2.05$,	df = (P = 0.15)	5), I ² =51%				
					1		

Favours Control Favours Treatment

Effect of CGA on living at home

	Study or subgroup	Experimental n/N	Control n/N	Odds Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI
	1 Wards (direct admission)					
	Asplund 2000	121/190	134/223	-	9.4 %	1.16[0.78, 1.74]
	Collard 1985	163/218	319/477	1 - -	10.6 %	1.47 [1.02, 2.10]
	Counsell 2000	536/767	531/764	- 3	33.6 %	1.02 [0.82, 1.27]
	Fretwell 1990	104/221	92/215	-	10.4 %	1.19 [0.81, 1.73]
	Harris 1991	67/97	106/170		5.0 %	1.35 [0.79, 2.29]
2	Landefeld 1995	260/327	233/324		10.1 %	1.52 [1.06, 2.18]
	Subtotal (95% CI)	1820	2173	•	79.0 %	1.20 [1.05, 1.38]
	Total events: 1251 (Experimen Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.20, df Test for overall effect: Z = 2.64	tal), 1415 (Control) = 5 (P = 0.39); l ² =4% \$ (P = 0.0082)				
N	2 Wards (stepdown admission	•)				
	Applegate 1990	62/78	4////		20 %	2.47 [1.21, 5.06]
	Kay 1992	16/30	17/29		1.7 %	0.81 [0.29, 2.26]
	Rubenstein 1984	46/63	32/60		1.9 %	2.37 [1.12, 5.03]
	Saltvedt 2002	101/127	79/127		3.4 %	2.36 [1.35, 4.14]
	White 1994	14/20	7/20		0.4 %	4.33 [1.15, 16.32]
	Subtotal (95% CI)	318	313	•	9.4 %	2.20 [1.56, 3.09]
4	Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.85$, df Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.52$ 3 Teams (direct admission)	$F = 4 (P = 0.30); I^2 = 189$ 2 (P < 0.00001)	2			
	Naughton 1994	39/51	44/60		2.0 %	1.18 [0.50, 2.80]
	Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 39 (Experimental Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect; Z = 0,38 4 Teams (acute admission)	51). 44 (Control) 3 (P = 0.70)	60	T	2.0 %	1.18 [0.50, 2.80]
1	McVey 1989	61/93	64/92		4.6 %	0.83 [0.45, 1.55]
	Subtotal (95% CI)	93	92	+	4.6 %	0.83 [0.45, 1.55]
	Total events: 61 (Experimental), Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.58 5 Teams (stepdown admission)	. 64 (Control) (P = 0.56)				
A	Winograd 1993	68/99	74/98		4.9 %	0.71 [0.38, 1.33]
	Subtotal (95% CI)	99	98	-	4 9 %	071 [038 133]
	Total events: 68 (Experimental).	, 74 (Control)	28		4.9 70	0.71[0.36, 1.35]
	Heterogeneity: not applicable					
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.07$	(P = 0.29)				
1.1	Total (95% CI)	2381	2736	•	100.0 %	1.25 [1.11, 1.42]
	Total events: 1658 (Experiment	al), 1779 (Control)	0.01			
11	Heterogeneity: Chi* = 25.57, di	F = 13 (P = 0.02); P = 4	9%			
	Test for subresum differences C	(P = 0.00021) $2k^2 = 15.60 dr = 4.00 dr$	- 0.001 12 - 7494			
	resction subgroup differences, c		- 0.00), 1 - 7478			
				0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
				Favours control Favours experim	ental	

	Effect of CGA on living at home @6/12 Ellis G. CGA for older adults. Cochrane 2011; 7: Art No.: CD006211				
Т	Type of intervention	Odds Ratio (95% CI)			
۷	Vards (direct admission)	1.20 (1.05-1.38)			
٧	Vards (stepdown admission)	2.20 (1.56-3.09)			
Т	Teams (direct admission)	1.18 (0.50-2.80)			
٦	Teams (acute admission)	0.83 (0.45-1.55)			
٦	Teams (stepdown admission)	0.71 (0.38-1.33)			
C	Overall	1.25 (1.11-1.42)			



Exercise for acutely hospitalised older medical patients de Morton N. Cochrane 2007, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD005955

- Exercise intervention varied considerably
- 6 trials multidisciplinary interventions incl. exercise
- 3 trials exercise only walking program and exercises individually tailored by a physiotherapist
- All compared to 'usual hospital care'

Study or subgroup 🚺	DT+Treatment	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
Cauraall 2000	n/IN		M-H,Fixed,95% CI	71.2.9/	M-H,FIXed,95% C
Counsell 2000	490//14	464/705		/1.5 %	1.06 [0.99, 1.14
Landefeld 1995	207/297	184/285		28.7 %	1.08 [0.96, 1.21
Total (95% CI)	1011	990	◆	100.0 %	1.07 [1.00, 1.13]
Test for overall effect: Z :	= 2.04 (P = 0.041)	-0.0%			
Exerc Study or subgroup Ti	ise Only reatment N Mean(S	Control D) N	0.5 0.7 I I.5 2 Favours control Favours treatr Std. Mean E Mean(SD) IV,Fixed,959	nent Difference Weight 6 Cl	Std. Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% C
de Morton 2006	80 11.9 (15	.9) 87	9.7 (14)		0.15 [-0.16, 0.45
Jones 2006	63 11 (9	.5) 63	9 (10)	43.0 %	0.20 [-0.15, 0.55
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.0$ Test for overall effect: Z =	143 6, df = 1 (P = 0.81); l ² 1.46 (P = 0.14)	1 50 =0.0%	-	100.0 %	0.17 [-0.06, 0.40



D/C to preadmission residence

	Study or subgroup MD	T+ Ireatment	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
		n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
	Asplund 2000	152/182	166/217		25.3 %	1.09 [0.99, 1.20]
1,	Collard (C) 1985	66/90	136/202		14.0 %	1.09 [0.93, 1.27]
Y	Collard (S) 1985	96/120	204/261		21.5 %	1.02 [0.92, 1.14]
1	Landefeld 1995	260/303	233/300	-	39.2 %	1.10 [1.02, 1.19]
V	Total (95% CI)	695	980	•	100.0 %	1.08 [1.03, 1.14]
	Total events: 574 (Treatme	nt), 739 (Control)				
VF	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.31	I, df = 3 (P = 0.73); I ²	=0.0%			
	Test for overall effect: Z =	3.06 (P = 0.0022)				
				0.5 0.7 I I.5 2		
	Exercise	e only		Favours control Favours treatment		
Ψ,	Study or subgroup	Treatment	Control	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
		n/N	n/N	M-H,Random,95% Cl		M-H,Random,95% Cl
	de Morton 2006	85/108	98/124	•	57.7 %	1.00 [0.87, 1.14]
	Jones 2006	43/71	33/77	-	42.3 %	1.41 [1.03, 1.94]
1	Total (95% CI)	179	201	•	100.0 %	1.15 [0.80, 1.66]
	Total events: 128 (Treatme	ent), 131 (Control)				
	Heterogeneity: $T_{2}u^{2} = 0.0$	$6: Chi^2 = 457 df = 10$	$P = 0.03 + 1^2 = 78\%$			
	Trat for averall offer to 7 =	0, CH = 1.57, C = 1	1 - 0.05),1 -/0/0			
	lest for overall effect: Z -	0.77 (P – 0.44)				
	1					
				0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10		
				Favours control Favours treatment		



- Malnutrition a common problem for older patients and those with chronic diseases
- Malnutrition contributes to deconditioning and poor outcomes.

Nutritional screening for improving professional practice for patient outcomes in hospital and primary care settings Omidvari AH. Cochrane 2013; 6

 Found three studies of nutrition screening, but no significant outcomes at all.



- Included 24 studies of nutritional intervention (multicomponent/ high protein/ vitamins/ peptides/ dietitian) by various routes (oral, NG, IV) after hip #.
- Mortality Risk ratio (RR) 0.76, 95%
 CI 0.42 to 1.37
- Complications RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.58-1.13
- ADL Function no change

Nutritional supplements for hip # patients

Avenell A. Cochrane Issue 1, 2010.

Study ID	Intervention (n, mean, sd)		Control (n, mean, se	d)		Mean difference (99% confidence interval)
Oral supplements							
Brown 1992	5	27.00	10.00	5	48.00	37.00	-21.00 days (-65.15 to 23.15)
Bruce 2003	50	17.70	9.40	58	16.60	9.20	1.10 days (-3.53 to 5.73)
Madigan 1994	18	16.00	8.00	12	15.00	11.00	1.00 day (-8.51 to 10.51)
Nasogastric tubet	feeding						
Sullivan 1998	8	38.20	36.90	7	23.70	20.00	14.50 days (-24.34 to 53.34)
High protein supp	lements						
Espaulella 2000	85	16.40	6.60	86	17.20	7.70	-0.80 days (-3.62 to 2.02)
Neumann 2004	18	23.20	5.52	20	28.00	11.63	-4.80 days (-12.29 to 2.69)
Vitamin B1							·
Day 1988	28	35.00	34.00	30	29.00	30.00	6.00 days (-15.75 to 27.75)

The Journal of Nutrition, Health & Aging© Volume 16, Number 6, 2012

MALNUTRITION SCREENING AND EARLY NUTRITION INTERVENTION IN HOSPITALISED PATIENTS IN ACUTE AGED CARE: A RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL

M. HOLYDAY¹, S. DANIELLS¹, M. BARE¹, G.A. CAPLAN², P. PETOCZ³, T. BOLIN⁴

1. Department of Nutrition & Dietetics, Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick, New South Wales, 2031, Australia; 2. Department of Geriatric Medicine, Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick, New South Wales, 2031, Australia; 3. Department of Statistics, Macquarie University, North Ryde, New South Wales, 2109, Australia; 4. The Gut Foundation, Randwick, New South Wales, 2031, Australia. Address for correspondence: M. Holyday, Tel.: +61 2 93822871; Fax: +61 2 93822191. E-mail address: Margaret.Holyday@sesiahs.health.nsw.gov.au

Abstract: Objectives: High rates of malnutrition have been reported in the older hospitalized patient population. This is recognised to impact on patient outcomes and health costs. This study aimed to assess the impact of nutrition screening and intervention on these parameters. *Design:* Randomised controlled prospective study. *Setting:* The study was performed in the acute geriatric medicine wards of the Prince of Wales Hospital, Sydney Australia. *Participants:* All patients admitted to these wards under a geriatrician with an expected length of stay



Nutritional status on Mini Nutritional Assessment

Holyday M. J Nutrition Health Aging 2012; 16: 562-8.

	Intervention N (%)	Control N(%)
Well nourished	12 (17%)	12 (17%)
At-risk of malnutrition	47 (66%)	40 (56%)
Malnourished	12 (17%)	20 (28%)

Did not measure ADL function No change in Mortality

Length of stay Holyday M. J Nutrition Health Aging 2012; 16: 562-8.

	Intervention	Control	p value
Well nourished	9.0	11.7	0.48
At risk of malnutrition	13.8	11.0	0.20
Malnourished	10.6	19.5	0.013





Hospital in the Home

 If part of the cause of deconditioning is due to "being in hospital", treatment at home may reduce deconditioning

Systematic reviews

A meta-analysis of "hospital in the home"

Gideon A Caplan MB BS, MD, FRACP, Director,¹ and Conjoint Associate Professor²

"

Nur S Sulaiman MB BS. Registrar³

Dee A Mangin MB ChB. Director, General Practice Research Group⁴

Nicoletta Aimonino Ricauda MD.

Director, Hospital in the Home⁵

Andrew D Wilson MD, FRCGP, Professor of General Practice⁶

Louise Barclay BN. Nurse Manager¹ ospital in the home" (HITH) provides acute or subacute treatment in a patient's residence for a condition that would normally require

admission to hospital.¹ It is also known as "hospital at home", "home hospitalisation" and "early supported discharge",²⁻⁶ and it has been speculated that HITH improves outcomes. The key is substituting for inhospital care. HITH includes admission avoidance (ie, full substitution for hospitalisation) and early discharge followed by care at home (ie, shortened hospitalisation).^{7,8}

Most HITH services are nurse based, but they may include doctors and allied health professionals.^{9,10} Some focus on specialties (eg. surgical specialties,¹¹⁻²⁰ medical specialties,²¹⁻³³ rehabilitation medicine,^{34,35} geriatrics,^{36,37} psychiatry,³⁸⁻⁴² infectious diseases,^{43,44} respiratory diseases⁴⁵⁻⁵⁵ or orthopaedics⁵⁶), diagnostic groups (eg. hip fracture^{57,58} or stroke⁵⁹⁻⁷⁰) or a mixture.⁷¹ The literature is confusing because many studies on HITH do not use the term HITH (or any similar terms) and some studies use the term HITH but do not involve substitution for inhospital care.

Caplan GA. MJA 2012; 195: 512-9.
19% ↓ mortality
25% ↓ readmissions

Abstract

Objective: To assess the effect of "hospital in the home" (HITH) services that significantly substitute for inhospital time on mortality, readmission rates, patient and carer satisfaction, and costs.

Data sources: MEDLINE, Embase, Social Sciences Citation Index, CINAHL, EconLit, PsycINFO and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, from the earliest date in each database to 1 February 2012.

Study selection: Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) comparing HITH care with inhospital treatment for patients aged >16 years.

Data extraction: Potentially relevant studies were reviewed independently by two assessors, and data were extracted using a collection template and checklist. Data synthesis: 61 RCTs met the inclusion criteria. HITH care led to reduced mortality (odds ratio [OR], 0.81; 95% CI, 0.69 to 0.95; P = 0.008; 42 RCTs with 6992 patients), readmission rates (OR, 0.75; 95% CI, 0.59 to 0.95; P = 0.02; 41 RCTs with 5372 patients) and cost (mean difference, -156711; 95% CI, -2069.53 to -1064.69; P < 0.001; 11 RCTs with 1215 patients). The number needed to treat at home to prevent one death was 50. No

Effect of Hospital in the Home Treatment on Physical and Cognitive Function: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Gideon A. Caplan,^{1,2} Janis Coconis,¹ and Jan Woods¹

¹Post Acute Care Services, Prince of Wales Hospital, Sydney, Australia. ²School of Public Health and Community Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

Group	Admission Mean (SEM)	Discharge Mean (SEM)	<i>p</i> Value	(HITH) res
нпн			2	
Barthel	15.18 (0.98)	15.43 (1.00)	NS	
Instrumental Activities of Daily Living	6.76 (0.69)	7.39 (0.73)	.007	
Mental Status Questionnaire	7.08 (0.51)	7.45 (0.51)	.004	
Hospital group				
Barthel	14.78 (1.04)	14.73 (1.04)	NS	
Instrumental Activities of Daily Living	6.22 (0.74)	6.14 (0.73)	NS	
Mental Status Questionnaire	6.88 (0.56)	7.14 (0.56)	.031	



Multicomponent liberation + animation strategy

- Liberation \$\subset\$ exposure to mechanical ventilation + sedatives
 - Spontaneous awakening trials
 - Spontaneous breathing trials
- Animation early mobilisation
- "Awakening and Breathing Coordination, Delirium monitoring/management, and Early exercise/mobility" (ABCDE)

Results of ABCDE

Jackson JC. Crit Care Med 2012; 40: 1088-97. Balas MC. Crit Care Med 2014; 42: 1024-1036.

- \downarrow Time on ventilator
- \downarrow Delirium incidence
- \uparrow Cognitive function
- \uparrow ADL function



Conclusion

- Deconditioning is a common side effect of illness and hospitalisation for older people
- BUT, it can be reduced through a number of strategies

Griatric medicine is one of the youngest medical specialities in Australia but is also one of the fastest growing. Geriatric medicine offers a more holistic approach to patient care than organ-based internal-medicine sub-specialities. Patient-centred interventions aim to allow the patient to function optimally. This textbook has been designed to inspire and inform students of geriatric medicine about the science and art of aged care. The book is structured to follow how geriatric medicine elinicians approach

The book is structured to bolow now genatric-medicale clinicalis approach patients who present with geriatric syndromes and must be assisted by systems of care. In an introductory part, overviews are provided of the biology of ageing, comprehensive geriatric assessment (the conterstone of geriatric-medicine practice), multidisciplinary teamwork, and community services for older people in Australia. In the second part of the book, over 13 chapters, detailed coverage is provided of the geriatric syndromes, the so-called 'geriatric giants', immobility, incontinence, instability, and impaired intellect. In the third part of the book, over 10 chapters, 'Care in context' – care of older people in general practice and in residential aged care facilities, rehabilitation, acute and post-acute care, end-of-life issues, legal aspects of geriatric medicine, for example – is the focus; geriatric medicine is placed within the Australian health-care system. Individual chapters are written by specialist contributors. Case studies illustrate key points about assessment and management. Inclusion of three poems, by H W Longfellow, W B Yeats, and Dylan Thomas, will enable readers to 'feel the heart within geriatric medicine'.

Australasian medical students, junior hospital doctors working in geriatric medicine, and other members of aged-care teams (specialist nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, social workers, etc.), will find in this book a succinct, readable, and authoritative introduction to the principles and practice of geriatric medicine.

About the editor:

GODEON CAPTAN, MBBS (Sydney) MD (NSW) FRACP is a geriatrician with 20 years' experience. He is Director of Post Acute Care Services and Director of Geriatric Medicine at Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick, and a Conjoint Associate Professor at the University of New South Wales.



ÍP Communications

Geriatric Medicine: An Introduction

CAPLAN

Geriatric Medicine

An Introduction

EDITED BY GIDEON CAPLAN

IP Communications