

Abstract Presentations

3. Sanne van Kampen, The Netherlands



Health outcomes after initiating pulmonary rehabilitation in 4 countries on 3 continents

Dr. Sanne van Kampen Senior epidemiologist

National eHealth Living Lab Leiden University Medical Center The Netherlands 16 May 2020



Background

- Highest burden of chronic respiratory disease (CRD) lies in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC); e.g. 90% of COPD deaths
- Health services in LMICs are ill-equipped to address CRDs and often lack access to medicine
- Pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) is an non-pharmaceutical intervention proven to optimise exercise capacity, quality of life and functional status, and reduce breathlessness and hospitalisation.

^{1.} Soriano, et al. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2017; 2. Adeloye, et al. *J Glob Health*. 2015; 3. Buist, et al. *The Lancet*. 2007; 4. Allotey, et al. *BMC Public Health*. 2014; 5. van Gemert, *Expert review of respiratory medicine*. 2018; 6. Spruit, et al. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013



Fresh Air project



Aim: Assess effectiveness of pulmonary rehabilitation for chronic

lung disease in low-resource settings

Countries: Greece, Kyrgyzstan, Vietnam, Uganda

Duration: October 2015 – September 2018

Intervention:

- 6 weeks twice-weekly programme of:
 - Exercises including strength and walking-based endurance
 - o Education on lifestyle and self-management/coping techniques
- Provided by local physiotherapists, doctors and nurses at as out-patient care





Methods

- <u>Patient inclusion criteria</u>: confirmed diagnosis of a CRD and MRC dyspnoea scale >=2
- Outcomes: incremental shuttle waking test, clinical COPD questionnaire score, MRC dyspnoea scale, Karnofsky score, self-reported chest pain, cough and haemoptysis
- Recorded at the beginning, immediately at the end and 6 weeks after the end of the PR programme





Programme participants (n=116)

Total	Uganda	Vietnam	Kyrgyzstan	Greece	
n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
116 (100)	44 (100)	24 (100)	17 (100)	31 (100)	
59 (51)	27 (61)	10 (42)	7 (41)	15 (48)	
12 (10)	0 (0)	2 (8)	5 (29)	5 (16)	
39 (34)	5 (11)	10 (42)	14 (82)	10 (32)	
36 (31)	34 (77)	2 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
23 (20)	4 (9)	8 (33)	2 (12)	9 (29)	
18 (16)	1 (2)	4 (17)	1 (6)	12 (39)	
median (IQR)	median (IQR)	median (IQR)	median (IQR)	median (IQR)	
60 (49, 69)	49 (39, 58)	61 (59, 69)	58 (51, 62)	71 (65, 76)	
58 (42, 77)	54 (41, 75)	43.0 (35, 56)	49 (26, 68)	81 (59, 98)	
	n (%) 116 (100) 59 (51) 12 (10) 39 (34) 36 (31) 23 (20) 18 (16) median (IQR) 60 (49, 69)	n (%) n (%) 116 (100) 44 (100) 59 (51) 27 (61) 12 (10) 0 (0) 39 (34) 5 (11) 36 (31) 34 (77) 23 (20) 4 (9) 18 (16) 1 (2) median (IQR) median (IQR) 60 (49, 69) 49 (39, 58)	n (%) n (%) n (%) 116 (100) 44 (100) 24 (100) 59 (51) 27 (61) 10 (42) 12 (10) 0 (0) 2 (8) 39 (34) 5 (11) 10 (42) 36 (31) 34 (77) 2 (8) 23 (20) 4 (9) 8 (33) 18 (16) 1 (2) 4 (17) median (IQR) median (IQR) median (IQR) 60 (49, 69) 49 (39, 58) 61 (59, 69)	n (%) n (%) n (%) n (%) 116 (100) 44 (100) 24 (100) 17 (100) 59 (51) 27 (61) 10 (42) 7 (41) 12 (10) 0 (0) 2 (8) 5 (29) 39 (34) 5 (11) 10 (42) 14 (82) 36 (31) 34 (77) 2 (8) 0 (0) 23 (20) 4 (9) 8 (33) 2 (12) 18 (16) 1 (2) 4 (17) 1 (6) median (IQR) median (IQR) median (IQR) median (IQR) 60 (49, 69) 49 (39, 58) 61 (59, 69) 58 (51, 62)	



Conventional PR outcomes (n=112)

	Before PR	After PR	Difference	p-value	CMID
		Mean (95%CI)		Paired t-test	
ISWT (metres)	264 (248, 281)	360 (338, 381)	95 (80, 110)	<0.0001	47.5
Karnofsky score	77 (75, 78)	86 (85, 88)	10 (9, 11)	< 0.0001	
CCQ total score	19 (18, 20)	10 (9.3, 11)	-8.7 (-10, -7.3)	< 0.0001	-4.0
MRC dyspnoea					
scale	2.8 (2.7, 3.0)	1.9 (1.8, 2.0)	-0.9 (-1.1, -0.7)	<0.0001	-1.0
	Proportion % (95% CI)			Paired X2 test	
Chest pain	60 (51, 69)	14 (8, 21)	-46 (-34, -57)	<0.0001	
Haemoptysis	6 (2, 11)	2 (-1, 4)	-4 (-10, 1)	0.0445	
Cough (n=88)	56 (45, 66)	44 (34, 55)	-11 (-26, 3.3)	0.0658	



Conclusions

- Implementation of PR in low-resource settings was feasible and acceptable
- Improved exercise capacity, quality of life and reduction of breathlessness
- 1st study to report on the effects of PR on chest pain, cough & haemoptysis:
 - Chest pains and cough were very prevalent in all CRD patients
 - Major improvements in chest pain and haemoptysis for all CRD patients
 - Reduced cough was reported for COPD patients, but less so for other CRD patients.

What is the underlying biological mechanisms for a reduction in chest pain, cough & haemoptysis?





Acknowlegements

- Rupert Jones, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK
- Winceslaus Katagira, Makerere University Lung Institute, Kampala, Uganda
- Bruce Kirenga, Makerere University Lung Institute, Kampala, Uganda
- An Le Pham, University of Medicine & Pharmacy, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
- Nguyen Ngoc Minh, University of Medicine & Pharmacy, HCMC, Vietnam
- Marilena Anastasaki, University of Crete, Heraklion, Greece
- Christos Lionis, University of Crete, Heraklion, Greece
- Ioanna Tsiligianni, University of Crete, Heraklion, Greece
- Talant M Sooronbaev, Ministry of Health, Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic
- Niels Chavannes, Leiden University Medical Center, Netherlands
- Sally Singh, University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust, Leicester, UK



Statements

- Conflict of interest: The authors declare to have no conflict of interest.
- Funding: This study was part of the FRESH AIR project funded by the EU
 Research and Innovation program Horizon2020 (Health, Medical Research and
 the Challenge of Ageing) under grant agreement no. 680997 and facilitated by
 IPCRG. The Uganda component was funded by a Joint Global Health
 Development grant from the UK Medical Research Council, the Wellcome
 Foundation and the UK Government Department for International Development
 fund.