

Non-adherence to peri-exacerbation pulmonary rehabilitation: The people have spoken

Neil J Greening^{1,2}

Chronic Respiratory Disease
2015, Vol. 12(1) 3–4
© The Author(s) 2015
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1479972314565360
crd.sagepub.com



Exacerbations of COPD, particularly when resulting in hospitalisation, represent important events on both an individual and population level. It is appreciated that the effects of an exacerbation extend beyond the lungs, with significant reduction in physical performance and exercise limitation.¹ In the stable state pulmonary rehabilitation has been shown to be one of the most efficacious treatments^{2,3} and is firmly established as a central therapy in standard practice. The nature of pulmonary rehabilitation also lends itself to ameliorating the effects of an exacerbation, and over the past 10 years, post-exacerbation pulmonary rehabilitation has developed^{4,5} and is now well recognised and recommended by international guidelines.^{6,7}

Whilst post-exacerbation pulmonary rehabilitation is unequivocally beneficial in those that attend, it has more recently been appreciated that this comprises the minority of patients as more than 90% do not complete the programmes.⁸ Attempts to improve this uptake have so far been unsuccessful, with treatment earlier into the exacerbation^{9,10} or comparing early and late pulmonary rehabilitation resulting in negative outcomes.¹¹

In a study reported in this issue, Benzo and colleagues explore the reasons for declining to participate in a study of post-hospitalisation physical activity programmes.¹² This constituted 61% of people approached to take part in the study. Of these, the most frequent reason for non-participation was a lack of interest in taking part. This is not surprising, as the prospect of exercise therapy whilst acutely unwell would put off many healthy people, let alone those with significant baseline dyspnoea. It would be interesting to know how many of this group had previously undergone pulmonary rehabilitation and whether they had benefitted. The authors compare these to the “disengaged phenotype” recently described in a different cohort.¹³ It is important to note that this phenotype is valid at that point in time only. Natural recovery is clinically significant in this population,⁹

and whether they remain disengaged once back at their baseline has not been shown. Every effort should be made to offer pulmonary rehabilitation again, ensuring they are not denied a proven therapy.

The other large group of non-participants were those that described themselves as too sick or frail. Identification of this cohort is important as there is undoubtedly an unmet need for therapies aimed at patients who cannot exercise to the physiological requirement to evoke adaptation. These patients are likely to already be on maximal bronchodilator therapy and a more “symptoms-based” treatment package based around palliative care and refractory dyspnoea may well offer the best outcome.

One particular strength of this study by Benzo and colleagues was that the group studied would not normally be reported in trials as they declined to participate. This makes them of notable interest, as their health beliefs are likely to be different from the participants in other trials. However, their voice is of particular importance, as not only do they make up the majority of the population, they are also the group we are attempting to involve in treatment.

It is not yet known how best to address the implementation of peri-exacerbation pulmonary rehabilitation. The current model only benefits a small minority of patients, yet requires large and complex organisation. This study provides a clue to the

¹ Institute of Lung Health, Leicester Respiratory Biomedical Research Unit, Glenfield Hospital, Leicester, UK

² Department of infection, immunity, and inflammation, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

Corresponding author:

Neil J Greening, University Hospitals of Leicester, Leicester Respiratory Biomedical Research Unit, Glenfield Hospital, Leicester, UK.

Email: njg27@le.ac.uk

direction the area should be headed, by asking those most centrally involved.

Acknowledgements

Dr Greening is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Leicester Respiratory Biomedical Research Unit. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health.

References

1. Spruit MA, Gosselink R, Troosters T, et al. Muscle force during an acute exacerbation in hospitalised patients with COPD and its relationship with CXCL8 and IGF-I. *Thorax* 2003; 58: 752–756.
2. Griffiths TL, Burr ML, Campbell IA, et al. Results at 1 year of outpatient multidisciplinary pulmonary rehabilitation: A randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2000; 355: 362–368.
3. Lacasse Y, Goldstein R, Lasserson TJ and Martin S. Pulmonary rehabilitation for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006(4): CD003793.
4. Man WD, Polkey MI, Donaldson N, et al. Community pulmonary rehabilitation after hospitalisation for acute exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Randomised controlled study. *BMJ* 2004; 329: 1209.
5. Puhan MA, Gimeno-Santos E, Scharplatz M, et al. Pulmonary rehabilitation following exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011(10): CD005305.
6. Bolton CE, Bevan-Smith EF, Blakey JD, et al. British Thoracic Society guideline on pulmonary rehabilitation in adults. *Thorax* 2013; 68(Suppl 2): ii1–30.
7. Spruit MA, Singh SJ, Garvey C, et al. An official American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society statement: Key concepts and advances in pulmonary rehabilitation. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2013; 188: e13–e64.
8. Jones SE, Green SA, Clark AL, et al. Pulmonary rehabilitation following hospitalisation for acute exacerbation of COPD: Referrals, uptake and adherence. *Thorax* 2014; 69: 181–182.
9. Greening NJ, Williams JE, Hussain SF, et al. An early rehabilitation intervention to enhance recovery during hospital admission for an exacerbation of chronic respiratory disease: Randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2014; 349: g4315.
10. Eaton T, Young P, Fergusson W, et al. Does early pulmonary rehabilitation reduce acute health-care utilization in COPD patients admitted with an exacerbation? A randomized controlled study. *Respirology* 2009; 14: 230–238.
11. Puhan MA, Spaar A, Frey M, et al. Early versus late pulmonary rehabilitation in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients with acute exacerbations: A randomized trial. *Respiration; International Review of Thoracic Diseases* 2012; 83: 499–506.
12. Benzo R, Wetzstein M, Neuenfeldt P and McEvoy C. Implementation of physical activity programs after COPD hospitalizations: Lessons from a randomized study. *Chronic Respiratory Disease* 2015; 12: 5–10.
13. Harrison SL, Robertson N, Graham CD, et al. Can we identify patients with different illness schema following an acute exacerbation of COPD: A cluster analysis. *Respiratory Medicine* 2014; 108: 319–328.