

iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Journal Club	AHRRTS (1)
JC Facilitator	Keith Layton
JC Discipline	Physiotherapy

Clinical Scenario

What is the evidence for the safety and effectiveness of home-based rehabilitation in improving outcomes in patients with pulmonary or cardiac problems?

Review Question/PICO/PECO

- P** clients eligible for pulmonary, cardiac, or heart failure rehabilitation
- I** community centre-based or hospital group rehabilitation
- C** home based one-on-one rehabilitation
- O** Functional Capacity (eg. 6MWT) and QoL (e.g. Chronic Respiratory Questionnaire) at completion, 6 months and 2 years; hospitalisation rate, cost per client

Article/Paper

Blair J, Corrigall H, Angus NJ, Thompson DR, Leslie S 2011 'Home versus hospital-based cardiac rehabilitation: a systematic review' *Rural and Remote Health*, 11: 1532 (online).

Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).

Article Methodology: Systematic review

Journal Club Meeting on: 15 February 2012



University of
South Australia

iCAHE

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review ask a clearly-focused question?</p> <p>This systematic review was undertaken to summarise the current evidence about community- and home-based cardiac rehabilitation with a focus on issues related to remote and rural populations.</p> <p><i>Population</i> adults >19 years old post MI, PTCS, CABG, coronary heart disease, or congestive heart failure; had been discharged from hospital and post discharge care that involves cardiac rehabilitation in a home or community setting</p> <p><i>Intervention</i> cardiac rehabilitation in a home or community setting</p> <p><i>Comparison</i> hospital-based, or anything other than home-based</p> <p><i>Outcome</i> physical activity levels, psychological status, clinical outcomes</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the review include the right type of study?</p> <p>The authors did not explicitly state the type of studies included in the review, although it appears that they've considered any paper which satisfied the inclusion criteria. As the aim of the review was to examine the available evidence on home-based rehabilitation, it would be appropriate not to limit the studies to any particular research design.</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES</p>
3	✓			<p>Did the reviewers try to identify all relevant studies?</p> <p>The reviewers searched PubMed, EMBASE, CINAHL and the Cochrane Controlled Trials Register. Hand searches of reference lists were also conducted to identify additional studies.</p>
4			✓	<p>Did the reviewers assess the quality of the included studies?</p> <p>The reviewers did not assess the quality of the included studies. It would have been ideal if the authors examined the quality of the included papers. Because most of the articles were randomised controlled trials, they could have provided an evidence base for the effectiveness of home-based cardiac rehabilitation (based on the quality and strength of the available evidence)</p>

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
iCAHE@unisa.edu.au
Phone: +61 8 830 22099
Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia
GOP Box 2471
Adelaide SA 5001
Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
00121B



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence
A member of the Sansam Institute

5	NA	<i>If the results of the studies have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</i> The studies found were too heterogeneous to combine in a meta-analysis, so the authors analysed the evidence qualitatively instead (narrative synthesis). The evidence for home-based rehabilitation was described for every outcome (.e.g. prevalence of angina, hospital readmissions, physical activity, etc).
6		How are the results presented and what is the main result? The authors provided a table which summarises the outcomes from every included study. Narrative summaries of evidence for each outcome were also presented. <i>Bottom line result</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Home-based cardiac rehabilitation appears to be a safe, viable and effective option for eligible patients who are not able to access the traditional hospital-based cardiac rehabilitation programs.
7	NA	<i>How precise are these results?</i> Precision of results cannot be determined based on how the review was analysed.
8	Journal Club to answer	Can the results be applied to the local population? Were all important outcomes considered? Should policy or practice change as a result of the evidence contained in this review?

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
iCAHE@unisa.edu.au
 Phone: +61 8 830 22099
 Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia
 GOP Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 00121B



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence
 A member of the Sansam Institute