
Inpatient rehabilitation - A systematic Pub Med review

H Yilmaz, L Kozikoglu

Citation

H Yilmaz, L Kozikoglu. *Inpatient rehabilitation - A systematic Pub Med review*. The Internet Journal of Rehabilitation. 2009 Volume 1 Number 1.

Abstract

rehabilitation aims at an improvement of function, capacity and participation¹. Outpatient and inpatient programs are available worldwide for the rehabilitation of patients with impairments or disabilities in various medical field. Aim of this paper is to find evidence for inpatient rehabilitation independent of the speciality, because there are certain claims of the German pension scheme trying to influence and determine content and quality management of inpatient rehabilitation. Two papers were found when searching for prospective controlled studies, none were found searching for a RCT. The two papers found were reviews citing one prospective controlled study on scoliosis rehabilitation. At least one randomized controlled study has been found in a hand search, however this was a pre- / post design, not containing any data about mid- or long-term effects. The following conclusions can be drawn:- Actually there is no evidence for inpatient rehabilitation in terms of health related issues. To gain the psychological effects striven for in rare conditions like in scoliosis, a two weeks rehabilitation program (or even less) can be considered as being sufficient. - Generally, inpatient rehabilitation does not seem to justify the high costs when there is no evidence for beneficial long-term outcomes.- The Quality management programs of the German pension scheme are not based on evidence and therefore are not justified.- Inpatient rehabilitation, if at all necessary, should be allocated to the health care insurances instead of the pension scheme, in order to avoid cost intensive double treatments.

INTRODUCTION

Medical rehabilitation aims at an improvement of function, capacity and participation¹. Outpatient and inpatient programs are available worldwide for the rehabilitation of patients with impairments or disabilities in various medical field. Especially in Germany there is a long history of inpatient rehabilitation for various diseases. The German Pension Insurance scheme has introduced a comprehensive practice guidelines programme for the development of process guidelines for inpatient rehabilitation. However outcome studies in this field are very rare, which would justify the costs of such treatment. Aim of this study is to find evidence for the application of inpatient rehabilitation programs.

In the era of evidence based medicine, the usefulness, necessity and efficiency of inpatient rehabilitation has to be proven as every other mode of treatment. For the German system of inpatient rehabilitation of chronic back pain available evidence is not conclusive, due to a lack of randomised controlled studies. The prevailing design of observational cohort studies has severe limitations in proving a causal relationship between outcomes and intervention².

The small size of medium term effects of inpatient rehabilitation indicates a basic problem of inpatient rehabilitation for chronic back pain in Germany. This becomes even greater when the results of international controlled studies are used as reference. Possible reasons for the disappointing situation are weak methodology, inappropriate selection of patients and weak intervention. At present, as pointed out by Hüppe and Raspe³ we have no convincing evidence for a general effectiveness of Germany's system of inpatient rehabilitation for chronic back pain.

There are other papers accepted in Pub Med listed journals, however these do not provide evidence for rehabilitation, but promote the assumptions of the senior staff members of the German Pension Insurance scheme⁴:

„Most of the patients treated have been suffering from chronic illness for many years and have developed psychological complaints besides their serious somatic symptoms and impairments. Here, rehabilitation takes on a fundamental assignment in the care of chronically ill patients. The projects carried out under the promotional focus highlight concrete perspectives for evidence based enhancement of medical rehabilitation. This, amongst others,

also holds true for the positive experience with treatment modules within specific vocational training and with patient education. Some of the insights gained are already being realized. As a current task of development, the findings point to further improving the sustainability of rehabilitation's positive impact particularly in chronic low back pain. Pertinent conceptual approaches can be derived from the projects presented."

Until now there is no clear consensus about the aim of rehabilitation in Germany.

This is reflected in a paper by Meyer et al ⁵ who have drawn the following conclusion: „ The significance of individual goal-setting as the “essence of rehabilitation” is not reflected in present-state rehabilitation in Germany. Starting points for change are found on different levels: patients, staff, development of organisational mission statements within the clinics, but also in changing organisational processes that appear to be dominated by economic directives.”

Mau ⁶ states that despite the lack of randomised controlled studies, which are frequently difficult to perform in the field of rehabilitation under the conditions of the German legislation and health care system, the studies discussed in his article, provide numerous useful data regarding the effects and cost-effectiveness of medical rehabilitation. Usually simple follow-up studies however are not regarded as to provide evidence enough to draw such conclusions.

There are numerous papers providing evidence that outpatient rehabilitation is as effective as inpatient rehabilitation ⁷⁻¹⁴. An outpatient cancer rehabilitation program may be an effective alternative treatment to inpatient programs for specific groups of patients ⁷.

There are no indications of poorer care quality in outpatient rehabilitation of orthopedic patients, while economic analyses show better cost effectiveness in outpatient treatment by comparability of treatment, patients, and results ⁹. The results of the latter study suggest that outpatient care, offered in the same quality as in the examined rehabilitation centres, is an alternative or complement to inpatient care at least for those patients, who can be treated in both the outpatient and inpatient setting ⁹. Also different cardiac rehabilitation programs (in- and outpatient) can be regarded as comparable concerning effectiveness and costs following rehabilitation ¹⁰.

In a prospective longitudinal study ¹¹, stroke patients with largely intact ADL-functions who were treated in a

rehabilitation center were assessed at the beginning and end of rehabilitation treatment and 6 months afterwards. They were treated as outpatients, if they expressed a preference for this setting and if outpatient rehabilitation was logistically and geographically possible, otherwise as inpatients. The authors found medium- to large-size gains for physical and ADL function and associated quality-of-life dimensions (WHOQOL-BREF, SF-36). However, there were also losses in other aspects of quality of life, e. g. in the social domain. There were no differences with respect to type of setting. Patients' setting preferences influenced the development of perception of own health. There was only a small and insignificant influence of satisfaction with rehabilitation treatment ¹¹.

An article by Klingelhöfer and Lätsch ¹² outlines the findings of a project comparing the economic effects of outpatient and inpatient rehabilitation in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. The study statistically covers the total population of applicants for orthopaedic-traumatologic rehabilitation who are suitable for outpatient rehabilitation. As a randomised and controlled study, it compares outcome parameters of the two variants of rehabilitation. Because the results are approximately equal, analysing the differences between amounts and periods of payments and costs for the pension insurance agency do not result in disadvantages for the patients. The results obtained from the investigation confirm that, in suitable patients, outpatient rehabilitation can achieve approximately the same outcomes as inpatient rehabilitation - but at distinctly lower cost ¹².

No clear-cut differences between in- and outpatient modes of rehabilitation were detected in a study with patients suffering from rheumatoid arthritis (RA) ¹⁴. Both modes showed improvement in different assessment parameters; patients with higher education and, therefore, with a less joint-disturbing work profile appeared to profit more from an extensive inpatient rehabilitation program. Patients with less education and a more manually-oriented working profile, did worse and had a higher tendency to seek medical pensioning, in spite of rehabilitative measures. As the total costs for outpatient rehabilitation only add up to 15.8% of the total costs for inpatient rehabilitation, this study setting cautiously suggests that outpatient rehabilitation might be an acceptable alternative to individualized patient groups that might not compromise clinical and vocational outcome. Larger patient groups are needed, however, to confirm these findings ¹⁴.(Fig 1)

Also the matter of long-term effect of rehabilitation is discussed controversial. While Hüppe and Raspe³ were not able to detect long-lasting effect of rehabilitation in their study, Dippelt et al.¹⁵ found at least some evidence, however not in a controlled study design.

Interestingly adverse effects of inpatient rehabilitation have also been found, but there are not many investigations focussing on this topic¹⁶.

Despite of the opinion of many researchers in the field of rehabilitation⁶, Schlademann et al.¹⁷ have shown the feasibility of a randomised controlled trial in rehabilitation-related Health Services Research. Nevertheless, the use of questionnaires¹⁸ in the evaluation of rehabilitation outcomes may be questioned due to the dissonance effect, not rarely leading to false positive results¹⁹.

Aim of this paper is to find evidence for inpatient rehabilitation independent of the speciality, because there are certain claims of the German pension scheme trying to influence and determine content and quality management of inpatient rehabilitation. Studies on neurologic, pediatric, orthopedic and all other specialities like oncology have been taken into account.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Types of studies included: clinical evaluations of inpatient rehabilitation, which are prospective, controlled or randomised controlled trials. Meta analyses, due to their recognised good standard have also been included. To attempt to detect the true effects of the treatment, the control group must have consisted of patient groups with observation as the only intervention. Only studies better than level III have been taken into account, as these have been shown to be a good standard in health care research.

Search strategy for identification of the studies; Pub Med; Medline; Key words: "inpatient rehabilitation", "prospective controlled study" / "inpatient rehabilitation", "randomized controlled study"

RESULTS

Two papers were found when searching for prospective controlled studies, none were found searching for a RCT. The two papers found were reviews citing one prospective controlled study on scoliosis rehabilitation. One paper has been found by hand search which was randomized and controlled, however did not display in the Pub Med search²⁰.

DISCUSSION

Inpatient scoliosis rehabilitation has been assessed in a prospective controlled study. However, the study published 2003 was performed with patient samples treated between 1989 and 1991 when the program lasted 6 weeks at average. Rehabilitation length has been reduced drastically since then. The results of postural changes are no more significant today and the improvement of vital capacity after inpatient rehabilitation is far from the values obtained in 1991²¹.

Meanwhile there is evidence that improvements of health related measures can be achieved using outpatient based rehabilitation concepts and that outpatient based programs have similar rates of surgery^{22,23} when compared to the only inpatient concept described in literature²⁴.

While the material in the papers on the incidence of surgery in populations treated conservatively as cited above²²⁻²⁴ consisted of patients with curvatures of more than 30°, there is also a paper on the same topic from an Italian team with an average curve at the start of observation of less than 24° and an age of more than 13 years²⁵. Considering the fact that the average patient from this population of mainly mediterranean girls has at least Risser 2, the calculated risk for progression is less than 40% and therefore this population would not have needed any treatment at all, especially no brace treatment²⁶. Therefore we have not taken the latter low quality paper into consideration when comparing inpatient to outpatient treatment within this review. (Fig 2)

There is no evidence that inpatient scoliosis rehabilitation with reduced rehabilitation times (3-4 weeks) is superior to outpatient rehabilitation. Without a doubt especially in scoliosis rehabilitation the psychological effect of inpatient rehabilitation may be an important issue, but there is no evidence that with respect to health related issues actually inpatient rehabilitation with reduced treatment times is superior to outpatient based concepts as it has been earlier on (6 weeks program).

At least one randomized controlled study has been found in a hand search, however this was a pre- / post design, not containing any data about mid- or long-term effects²⁰.

We therefore accept that the search might be incomplete. Nevertheless, if our search would not find more evidence easily, we may assume that there is not enough evidence for inpatient rehabilitation available in literature at the moment to justify the immense costs of inpatient rehabilitation born

by the community. A healthcare system run by a pension scheme, parallel to the general one can economically be regarded as outdated in view of the limited resources there are for health care in all countries and communities worldwide.

CONCLUSIONS

Actually there is no evidence for inpatient rehabilitation in terms of health related issues. To gain the psychological effects striven for in rare conditions like in scoliosis, a two weeks rehabilitation program (or even less) can be considered as being sufficient.

Generally, inpatient rehabilitation does not seem to justify the high costs when there is no evidence for beneficial long-term outcomes.

The Quality management programs of the German pension scheme are not based on evidence and therefore are not justified.

Inpatient rehabilitation, if at all necessary, should be allocated to the health care insurances²⁷ instead of the pension scheme, in order to avoid cost intensive double treatments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors declare to have no competing interests. This paper is based upon an e-poster presentation by Lale Kozikoglu at the 5th World Congress of ISPRM, Istanbul, Turkey 13-17. June 2009 [28].

References

1. Baron S, Linden M: Analyzing the Effectiveness of Inpatient Psychosomatic Rehabilitation Using the Mini-ICF-APP [Analyzing the Effectiveness of Inpatient Psychosomatic Rehabilitation Using the Mini-ICF-APP]. *Rehabilitation* 2009; 48: 145-153.
2. Hüppe A, Raspe H: Die Wirksamkeit stationärer medizinischer Rehabilitation in Deutschland bei chronischen Rückenschmerzen: eine systematische Literaturübersicht 1980 - 2001. *Rehabilitation* 2003; 42: 143-154.
3. Hüppe A, Raspe H: Zur Wirksamkeit von stationärer medizinischer Rehabilitation in Deutschland bei chronischen Rückenschmerzen: Aktualisierung und methodenkritische Diskussion einer Literaturübersicht [Efficacy of Inpatient Rehabilitation for Chronic Back Pain in Germany: Update of a Systematic Review]. *Rehabilitation* 2005; 44: 24-33.
4. Haaf HG: Ergebnisse zur Wirksamkeit der Rehabilitation [Findings on the Effectiveness of Rehabilitation]. *Rehabilitation* 2005; 44: e1-e20.
5. Meyer T, Pohontsch N, Raspe H: Zielfestlegungen in der stationären somatischen Rehabilitation - die Herausforderung bleibt [Goal Setting in Inpatient Medical Rehabilitation - The Challenge Persists]. *Rehabilitation* 2009; 48: 128-134.
6. Mau W: Lanzeitverläufe nach Rehabilitation wegen muskuloskelettaler Erkrankungen. *Phys Rehab Kur Med* 2006; 16, A51.
7. Lehmann C, Bergelt C, Welk H, Hagen-Aukamp C, Berger D, Koch U: Unterscheiden sich ambulante und stationäre onkologische Rehabilitationsmaßnahmen im Hinblick auf Leistungserbringung und Erfolg? Eine Analyse der medizinischen Entlassungsberichte [Do Outpatient and Inpatient Rehabilitation Programs Differ in Applied Interventions and Success? An Analysis of Medical Discharge Summaries]. *Phys Rehab Kur Med* 2008; 18: 59-68.
8. Schönle PW: Ambulante und stationäre neurologische Rehabilitation - ein katamnästischer Vergleich [Outpatient and Inpatient Neurological Rehabilitation - A Follow-up Comparison]. *Rehabilitation* 2002; 41: 183-188.
9. Bürger W, Dietsche S, Morfeld M, Koch U: Ambulante und stationäre orthopädische Rehabilitation - Ergebnisse einer Studie zum Vergleich der Behandlungsergebnisse und Kosten [Ambulante und stationäre orthopädische Rehabilitation - Ergebnisse einer Studie zum Vergleich der Behandlungsergebnisse und Kosten]. *Rehabilitation* 2002; 41: 92-102.
10. vom Orde A, Schott T, Iseringhausen O: Behandlungsergebnisse der kardiologischen Rehabilitation und Kosten-Wirksamkeits-Relationen - Ein Vergleich stationärer und ambulanten Versorgungsformen [Outcomes of Cardiac Rehabilitation Treatment and Cost-effectiveness Relations - A Comparison between Inpatient and Outpatient Rehabilitation Programmes]. *Rehabilitation* 2002; 41: 119-129.
11. Bölsche F, Hasenbein U, Reißberg H, Schlote A, Wallesch CW: Ergebnisse der ambulanten und stationären Rehabilitation in den ersten sechs Monaten nach Schlaganfall [Results of In- vs Outpatient Post-Stroke Rehabilitation over 6 Months]. *Fortschr Neurol Psychiatr* 2003; 71: 458-468.
12. Klingelhöfer HE, Lätzsch A: Wirtschaftlichkeitsvergleich ambulante versus stationäre Rehabilitation [Comparing the Economy of Outpatient versus Inpatient Rehabilitation]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2003; 65: 163-166.
13. Maier-Riehle B, Schliehe F: Der Ausbau der ambulanten Rehabilitation [Expanding Outpatient Rehabilitation]. *Rehabilitation* 2002; 41: 76-80.
14. Nordström DC, Kontinen YT, Solovieva S, Friman C, Santavirta S: In- and out-patient rehabilitation in rheumatoid arthritis. A controlled, open, longitudinal, cost-effectiveness study. *Scand J Rheumatol*. 1996;25(4):200-6.
15. Dibbelt S, Greitemann B, Büschel C: Nachhaltigkeit orthopädischer Rehabilitation bei chronischen Rückenschmerzen - Das Integrierte orthopädisch-psycho-somatische Behandlungskonzept (IopKo) . *Rehabilitation* 2006; 45: 324-335.
16. Höder J, Mittag O, Arlt AC, Präcklein C, Raspe H: Risiken und Nebenwirkungen von medizinischer Rehabilitation: Annäherungen an ein wenig beachtetes Thema [Risks and Adverse Effects of Inpatient Rehabilitation: Reflections on a Widely Neglected Delicate Subject]. *Z Allg Med* 2007; 83: 153-158.
17. Schlademann S, Hüppe A, Raspe H: Ergebnisse einer randomisierten kontrollierten Studie zur Akzeptanz und zu Outcomes einer Beratung auf stationäre medizinische Rehabilitation unter erwerbstätigen GKV-Versicherten mit rheumatoider Arthritis (clinicaltrials.gov identifier NCT00229541) [Results of a Randomised Controlled Trial on the Acceptance and the Outcomes of a Counselling on Medical Inpatient Rehabilitation in Gainfully Employed Members of Statutory Health Insurances with Rheumatoid

Arthritis (clinicaltrials.gov identifier NCT00229541)].
Gesundheitswesen 2007; 69: 325-335.

18. Bullinger M, Morfeld M, Kohlmann T et al.: Der SF-36 in der rehabilitationswissenschaftlichen Forschung - Ergebnisse aus dem Norddeutschen Verbund für Rehabilitationsforschung (NVRF) im Förderschwerpunkt Rehabilitationswissenschaften [SF-36 Health Survey in Rehabilitation Research. Findings from the North German Network for Rehabilitation Research, NVRF, within the Rehabilitation Research Funding Programme].
Rehabilitation 2003; 42: 218-225.

19. Weiss HR, Goodall D: The treatment of adolescent idiopathic scoliosis (AIS) according to present evidence. A systematic review. Eur J Phys Rehabil Med. 2008 Jun;44(2):177-93.

20. Jäckel WH, Cziske R, Gerdes N, Jacobi E: [Assessment of the effectiveness of inpatient rehabilitation measures in patients with chronic low back pain: a prospective, randomized, controlled study]. Rehabilitation. 1990 May;29(2):129-33.

21. Weiss HR. The effect of an exercise program on vital capacity and rib mobility in patients with idiopathic scoliosis. Spine 1991;16:88-93.

22. Rigo M, Reiter C, Weiss HR: Effect of conservative

management on the prevalence of surgery in patients with adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. Pediatr Rehabil. 2003, 6:209-214.

23. Maruyama T, Kitagawa T, Takeshita K, Mochizuki K, Nakamura K: Conservative treatment for adolescent idiopathic scoliosis: can it reduce the incidence of surgical treatment? Pediatr Rehabil. 2003 Jul-Dec;6(3-4):215-9.

24. Weiss HR, Weiss G, Schaar HJ: Incidence of surgery in conservatively treated patients with scoliosis. Pediatr Rehabil. 2003, 6:111-8.

25. Negrini S, Atanasio S, Zaina F, Romano M, Parzini S, Negrini A. End-growth results of bracing and exercises for adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. Prospective worst-case analysis. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2008;135:395-408.

26. Weiss HR, Negrini S, Rigo M, Kotwicki T, Hawes MC, Grivas TB, Maruyama T, Landauer F; (SOSORT guideline committee). Indications for conservative management of scoliosis (guidelines). Scoliosis. 2006 May 8;1:5.

27. Beske F: Medizinische Rehabilitation in der gesetzlichen Krankenversicherung zusammenfassen und im Krankenhaus konzentrieren. Das Gesundheitswesen. 2003, 65: 417-421.

28. Weiss HR, Kozikoglu L, Goodall D: A systematic Pub Med review on in-patient rehabilitation. 5th World Congress of ISPRM, Istanbul, Turkey 13-17. June 2009

Author Information

H Yilmaz

Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Department, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University

LM Kozikoglu

Formed Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation