

European Respiratory Society Annual Congress 2012

Abstract Number: 1017
Publication Number: P1169

Abstract Group: 9.2. Physiotherapists

Keyword 1: Rehabilitation **Keyword 2:** No keyword **Keyword 3:** No keyword

Title: The effectiveness of carrying out 6 month and 1 year re-assessments for respiratory patients post pulmonary rehabilitation

Ms. Lynsey 5965 Wright lynsey.wright@surreypct.nhs.uk ¹, Mrs. Laura 5977 Cornish laura.cornish@surreypct.nhs.uk ¹, Mrs. Julie 5978 Tollit julie.tollit@surreypct.nhs.uk ¹, Mrs. Laura 5979 Webb laura.webb@surreypct.nhs.uk ¹, Mrs. Fran 5980 Dyer fran.dyer@surreypct.nhs.uk ¹ and Ms. Julia 5982 Bott julia.bott@surreypct.nhs.uk ¹. ¹ Respiratory Care Team, Surrey Community Health, Chertsey, United Kingdom, KT16 0QA .

Body: Introduction: Pulmonary Rehabilitation (PR) Re-assessment groups are offered at 6 months and 1 year post completion of PR. The purpose is to review patients current health status, monitor exercise tolerance, mood and quality of life and check compliance with self management skills taught in PR Aim: To determine the level of attendance at 6 months and 1 year re-assessments in order to establish whether this is an effective method of review, both for the patient and Community Respiratory Team. Method: All patients who completed PR were invited to re-assessments at 6 months and 1 year post PR. The number of patients who attended were recorded. Results: 262 patients completed PR between January 2009 and December 2012. 40 patients were excluded from assessments and analysis at the 6 months re-assessments due to staff shortages and severe weather. 13 patients (6 at 6 months and 7 at 1 year) had died and also excluded.

Table 1: Patient Attendance at Reassessments

Site	6 month Reassessment		1 year Reassessments	
	n=Attended/Invited	% Attended	n=Attended/Invited	% Attended
Site 1	28/52	54%	19/61	31%
Site 2	38/55	69%	27/74	36%
Site 3	23/47	49%	21/59	36%
Overall	89/154	58%	67/194	35%

Conclusion: These data indicate a drop of 23% in attendance at the 1 year reassessment from 6 months, therefore suggesting this may not be the most effective method of review and furthermore provides reasonable evidence to support a re-evaluation of the 1 year re-assessment. There is cause to ensure review of those not attending reassessments as they are at high risk of poor self management and the

ongoing review method of these patients needs further consideration.