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Abstract

The neurodegenerative process in Parkinson’s disease (PD) results in a relentless progression of motor and non-motor symptoms. Affected individuals are frequently hospitalised for complications of the disease including falls, fractures, infections, and neuropsychiatric symptoms. When admitted to hospital, inpatient care is often suboptimal as it focusses on the primary cause of admission, and is associated with poor patient outcomes and significant healthcare costs. **Aim:** To review existing literature for evidence-based interventions aimed at reducing hospital admissions in PD  

**Methods:** Electronic literature search in EMBASE, MEDLINE and CINAHL databases for studies evaluating interventions to reduce hospital admissions in PD. We included publications with full abstracts, published in the English language and addressing interventions to reduce hospital admissions in PD. **Results:** To date there are no randomised controlled trials addressing the topic. We identified nine relevant retrospective studies. Results from these studies suggest an association between frequent neurologist consultations, open access clinics, and medication compliance with a reduction in PD hospital admissions and emergency room visits. **Conclusion:** This systematic review highlights the lack of robust evidence for measures aimed at reducing hospital admissions in people with PD. Future prospective studies are required to evaluate the effectiveness of proposed interventions.

**Word count:** 2668
Introduction

Motor and non-motor symptoms in Parkinson’s disease (PD) steadily progress with advancing disease leading to complications such as falls, fractures, and infections; which are compounded by cognitive decline and Parkinson’s dementia. As a consequence, individuals with the disease are admitted to hospital more often than people without PD.[1, 2] In addition, medication-related complications add to the disease burden and increase the likelihood of hospital encounters.[3] Once PD patients are admitted to hospital, they have prolonged inpatient stays,[4] poor motor outcomes, infections, prescription errors, increased postoperative mortality,[5-8] and are more likely to have repeat hospital admissions.[9] A study in the United States reported a significant economic burden from PD hospitalisation: approximately 20% of estimated annual cost for PD ($4.6 billion US dollars) was due to inpatient costs.[4] Similarly in the UK, there is a substantial cost from non-elective PD admissions (annual expenditure £194 million).[10] Given the aging population, these costs are likely to rise.

Given the scale of PD hospitalisation, the associated morbidity, mortality, and costs, there is a need for interventions to reduce unplanned PD hospital admission. Such interventions should be cost-effective and focussed on reducing known risk factors for hospitalisation. The purpose of this article was to systematically review available literature for effective interventions aimed at preventing unplanned hospital admissions in individuals with PD.

Methods

A search for publications from EMBASE, MEDLINE and CINAHL databases up to September 2014 was performed. Eligibility criteria included randomised controlled trials
(RCTs) evaluating effectiveness of intervention versus no intervention in reducing hospital admissions and/or emergency department visits in patients with PD. Index terms and free text terms for ‘Parkinson’s disease’, Parkinson’s, ‘hospitalisation’, and hospital were used but this yielded no relevant randomised controlled trials. The search criteria were therefore broadened to include other study types. We included all studies where a specific measure was employed and led to a reduction in number of hospital admissions or emergency department visits in PD. Interventions included those that have been used in other chronic diseases to reduce unplanned hospital admissions such as patient educational programmes, urgent access clinics, specialist’s clinics and specialist nurses. Outcome measures included a reduction in either hospital admission, non-elective, unplanned admissions, or emergency room visits. Study participants were individuals with PD of all disease stages and duration. No age restrictions were applied. Abstracts and title headings were screened and only publications with full abstracts, published in the English language and addressing interventions to reduce hospital admissions in PD were included.

Results.

7,610 abstracts obtained from the three data sources were screened. Duplicates and publications addressing hospitalisation in conditions other than PD were excluded. 115 articles and abstracts were assessed for eligibility. From these, 105 excluded articles discussed issues pertaining to PD hospitalisation such as frequency and reasons for admissions, inpatient care and medication errors, but did not assess the effect of specific interventions on reducing hospital admissions in PD (figure 1). We found one randomised controlled trial (RCT) which assessed the effectiveness of two dysphagia management techniques in reducing the aspiration pneumonia and also measured hospitalisations as an adverse event.[11] Nine retrospective studies reported a change in healthcare utilisation
including the number of emergency visits and or hospitalisation after an intervention and these were included (Table 1). [12-20]

One RCT compared the incidence of pneumonia among 515 patients with dementia and PD who were randomised to either chin-down posture technique or two types of thickened fluids (nectar- and honey-thick consistencies) over a 3 month follow up period.[11] There was no difference in the incidence of pneumonia (primary outcome measure) between the two interventions. When the two types of thickened fluids were compared the cumulative incidence for pneumonia was less in the nectar-thick fluid compared to honey-thick fluid (0.08 and 0.15 respectively; HR 0.50 95% CI 0.23, 1.09).[11] The overall incidence of pneumonia reported in this study was low, however authors could not attribute the low incidence to the interventions used in this study because no placebo group was included.[11] Hospitalisations were reported as an adverse event and 20% of participants had at least one hospital admission in each of the two intervention arms. The number of withdrawals due to adverse events, including hospitalisations, was higher in the thickened fluid group (4%) compared to chin down posture group (2%); 2% difference, CI -0.4%, -5%).

A retrospective cohort study among 24,929 Medicare recipients in the United States (US) evaluated the effect of frequent neurologist care on PD hospitalisation and reported a reduction in hospital admissions for traumatic injury (HR 0.56, 95% CI 0.40-0.78), psychosis (HR 0.71, 95% CI 0.59-0.86) and urinary tract infection (HR 0.74 95% CI 0.63-0.87) in patients who had frequent neurologist care compared to those who were not treated by a neurologist.[12] Another US survey assessed the impact of neurologist care on healthcare costs and utilisation among 3,883 individuals with chronic neurological conditions including parkinsonism and showed that respondents who had consulted a neurologist had a reduction in disease-related home care, emergency, and inpatient care events compared to those with no neurologist involvement (OR 0.64, P=0.001).[13] In another retrospective study, PD patients
with poor motor symptom control, medication-related complications, or neuropsychiatric symptoms were allowed to access an urgent neurology clinic without prior appointment. This resulted in a 50% reduction in PD admissions over a 2 year period.[14] In addition there was a reduction in hospital length of stay from 11 to 4.5 days.[14]

Two retrospective studies reported fewer hospital admissions in PD patients treated with rasagiline when compared to dopamine agonists[15] or selegiline.[16] Comparisons of the number, duration, and cost of hospital admissions for 7,230 PD patients who were initially treated with either a dopamine agonist or rasagiline were compared using data from the Medicare Supplemental Database. The authors reported fewer hospital admissions (OR 0.76, 95% CI 0.66-0.86), shorter duration of stay (-0.38 day p< 0.0001), and reduced costs in rasagiline-treated patients compared to the DA group: $12,327 versus $16,525 respectively.[15] In a retrospective study involving 3,864 individuals with PD, Grubb et al showed that, rasagiline use was associated with lower emergency room visits (odds ratio: 0.79; 95% CI, 0.68 to 0.92) and all cause hospital admissions (odds ratio: 0.82; 95% CI, 0.68 to 0.99) compared to the selegiline-treated group.[16] However, no difference was found in the odds of PD-related hospital admissions and fractures.[16]

Four retrospective studies assessed the frequency of medication adherence in PD and also measured hospitalisation as an outcome. In a retrospective historical cohort study which included 1,215 from a US health claim database, Delea et al showed that patients with satisfactory levodopa/carbidopa/entacapone therapy compliance (proportion of days where a patient had medication supply \( \geq 80\% \)), had 49% fewer emergency room visits (p=0.010) and 39% less PD-related hospitalisations compared to the non-adherent group (p=0.001).[17] The number of all hospitalisations and overall PD-related costs were also lower in the group of patients with satisfactory treatment adherence.[17] In another study of 104 PD patients, suboptimal adherence to PD medication was associated with worsening motor symptoms.[19]
PD related hospitalisations and emergency room visits were used as an indicator of worsening motor symptoms, in addition to an increase PD medication dosage. Medication possession ratio (MPR), a measure of medication adherence was defined as the proportion of days covered by a PD prescription: the numerator was the number of days covered by a PD prescription and the denominator was the number of days between prescription disbursements.[19]. During the first year of follow up, the mean possession ratio, PD related emergency room visits, and hospitalisation were 0.52 ± 0.35, 0.07 ± 0.29, and 0.91± 2.19 respectively. In the 5th year the MPR was lower 0.42 ± 0.37 with higher emergency room visits and hospitalisation: 0.18± 0.70 and 1.40± 3.74. [19] In a retrospective cross-sectional study, Wei et al used Medicare administrative data for 7,583 patients with PD and found that those with a medication possession ratio of more than 90% had lower emergency room visits and hospitalisation rate than poor adherers (less 80% MPR).[18] Another US study evaluated the prevalence and cost of poor adherence to PD medication using retrospective administrative and claims data. The study included 3,119 participants who had a PD International classification of diseases (ICD) code recorded and were on PD medications during the study period. The mean number of hospitalisations over 12 months was significantly higher amongst individuals who were non-compliant with PD medication in comparison to the compliant group (2.3 versus 1.8; p<0.005).[20] However, there was no difference in the mean number of emergency room visits.[20] Mean health costs were significantly higher in the non-adherent group.[20]

Discussion

Hospitalisation in PD is a significant cost-driver[21] and patient outcome is often poor.[3-5] This review highlights the lack of evidence-based interventions for reducing PD patient hospitalisation.
Of the few studies we did find in this area, only one RCT of a specific intervention was found. This reported an low overall pneumonia incidence and no difference in the frequency of pneumonia when either chin-down posture or thickened fluids were used to manage dysphagia.[11] This study was limited by a short follow up period and the absence of a control group.[11] There was no difference in hospitalisation rates between the two interventions. Further, the cumulative pneumonia incidence was less when fluids with nectar compared to honey consistency were used.[11] This difference could have been a chance finding because the overall incidence of pneumonia in the study was low. Although speculative, the low pneumonia rates reported in the study suggests that chin-down posture and fluids of nectar/honey consistency may be useful interventions for pneumonia prevention.

We identified nine retrospective studies where hospitalisation rates and emergency room visits in PD were measured. These studies suggested that frequent neurologist consultation, open access clinics, and compliance with PD medication may reduce hospital admissions and emergency room attendance by PD patients. The cost effectiveness and the actual number and frequency of neurological consultations required to reduce PD hospitalisation is uncertain. Frequent consultations may provide opportunities for medication adjustments, earlier detection and management of complications which, in turn, reduces the need for hospitalisation.[12] Open access clinics also provide similar opportunities for symptoms and complication management which potentially prevents hospital admissions.[14] The effectiveness of open access clinics was based on a report from a single centre with no comparison group. An association between PD medication adherence and reduction in emergency room visits and PD-related hospital admissions was reported in four retrospective studies.[17-20] Sub-optimal adherence to PD medication can have negative implications on motor outcomes and patient quality of life.[22] These findings imply that optimising PD symptom control through medication compliance possibly reduces hospital admissions for
poor motor control. Interventions such as regular neurologist care and open access clinics may be difficult to implement in countries where some individuals have no health insurance. In addition, some patients may not be able to afford their PD prescriptions which may impact on medication adherence, motor symptom control, and therefore hospitalisation. A surprising finding was the association between rasagiline treatment and fewer hospital admissions reported in two retrospective studies.[15, 16] Dopamine agonists have superior symptomatic effects compared to monoamine oxidase inhibitor treatment. However, dopamine agonist treatment is associated with more side effects.[23] This may account for the fewer hospitalisations in rasagiline group. The differences in emergency room visits between selegiline and rasagiline treated patients cannot be explained. These two studies were funded by the rasagiline manufacturer which may have led to bias.

A major limitation of these studies is their retrospective design. Reliability of the reported results is dependent on the accuracy of the databases from which the data were extracted. It is also impossible to control for all confounding factors in such studies. Therefore, definitive conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the above interventions cannot be drawn based on this evidence. Nevertheless, these studies provide some insight into the interventions that require further evaluation.

Falls, fractures, infections, cognitive, and motor decline have been identified as risk factors for unplanned hospital admissions in patients with PD.[9] Implementing preventative measures for these complications may reduce the need for hospital admission. Falls in PD can occur as a result of postural instability, poor motor symptom control, and drug-related side effects (e.g. postural hypotension). Optimising motor symptom control and managing medication side effects may prevent falls and hence hospital admissions. Furthermore, physiotherapy is thought to improve PD motor symptoms, mobility, and balance,[24] which may also potentially reduce the risk of falls. A recent Cochrane review compared the
effectiveness of physiotherapy interventions and no intervention in PD on outcomes such as
gait, falls, and clinician-rated measures of impairment and disability. Health resource usage
including hospitalisation was not reported as an outcome measure. Although there was a
reported trend towards improvement in falls, there was no significant difference in the
number of falls between the physiotherapy and non-intervention arms in 6 studies from which
data could be abstracted.[24] The authors reported that the absence of a positive effect from
physiotherapy could have been a result of short follow up periods, reliance on falls diaries,
and the small number of participants in the included studies.[24] In terms of fracture
prevention, there is good evidence that osteoporosis prevention strategies such as Vitamin D
supplementation and bisphosphonates improve bone mineral density and reduce fracture risk
in PD.[25] Fracture prevention measures may reduce hospitalisation as shown in an Italian
retrospective study which included 5,167 postmenopausal women who were discharged from
hospital with primary or secondary diagnosis of hip fracture.[26] The study compared the
effect of treatment or no treatment with fracture prevention medication on mortality, re-
fracture rates, and costs of health resource use (including hospitalisation). For those who
were treated with bisphosphonates, the effect of compliance with treatment on these outcome
measures was also assessed.[26] Only 34% of the included patients were exposed to fracture
prevention treatments and 1,044 events (deaths and hospitalisation) were reported, and these
were related to re-fractures.[26] A significantly reduced incidence of death (-55%, p<0.001 )
and re-fracture related hospitalisations (-40% p<0.001) was reported when fracture treatment
was used.[26] In those who were treated with bisphosphonates, adherence of <40% was
associated with higher total costs including re-hospitalisation, compared to those with better
adherence.[26] It is uncertain if osteoporosis and fracture prevention measures translate into a
reduction in hospitalisation rates in PD. Early speech and language therapy involvement in
dysphagia management may potentially reduce the number of hospital admissions for
aspiration pneumonia. To date, no studies have systematically assessed whether pneumonia, falls, and fracture prevention strategies discussed above can reduce the number of hospital admissions in PD.

PD nurse specialists, where available, may play a crucial role in identifying PD patients in the community who are at high risk of hospitalisation. By working in liaison with other PD specialists in primary and secondary care, social services, palliative care and rehabilitation services, early treatment can be instituted in the patients’ home. Community PD nurse care has been shown to be cost neutral when compared to primary care physicians, in a randomised controlled trial.[27] However, effectiveness of this approach in reducing PD hospitalisation rates has not been assessed.

Interventions such as specialist clinics (multidisciplinary or nurse-led),[28] medication management,[29] and patient self-management educational programmes,[30] have been shown to be effective in reducing unplanned admissions in other chronic conditions. The limited evidence that is available in PD does suggest that specialist clinics and medication management may reduce hospitalisation and therefore these interventions require further evaluation.

This systematic review has highlighted a gap in evidence-base for interventions that are effective in reducing PD hospital admissions. Proposed measures are based mainly on retrospective studies and none have been systematically assessed in PD. Nevertheless, these interventions merit further evaluation in well-designed prospective trials. Considering the complexity of managing PD, it is likely that a multimodal approach which addresses motor and non-motor complications, as well as palliative aspects in end-stage disease, may be more effective compared to a single intervention approach. In view of the health costs and morbidity associated with PD hospitalisation, it is imperative that PD experts and policy
makers make a joint effort to finding ways to reduce hospitalisation in PD as the search for disease modifying treatment continues.
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Table 1: Proposed interventions for reducing Parkinson’s disease hospital admissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed intervention</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Study Group</th>
<th>Study intervention</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Effect of proposed intervention on hospitalisation and emergency room visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dysphagia management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins et al 2008[20]</td>
<td>Randomised Controlled Trial</td>
<td>515 (PD and dementia patients)</td>
<td>Chin down posture versus honey/nectar thick fluid</td>
<td>Pneumonia incidence. Hospitalisation measured as an adverse event</td>
<td>No difference in serious adverse events (including hospitalisation) between the two intervention groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequent Neurologist involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis et al 2012[11]</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort</td>
<td>24929 PD patients</td>
<td>Neurologist versus no neurologist care</td>
<td>PD-related and general medical related hospitalisation</td>
<td>Neurologist care associated with ↓ hospitalisation for traumatic injury (HR 0.56, 95% CI 0.40-0.78), psychosis (HR 0.71, 95% CI 0.59-0.86) and urinary tract infection (HR 0.74 95% CI 0.63-0.87).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ney et al 2013[12]</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>3883 Parkinsonism, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, dementia.</td>
<td>Neurologist ambulatory care</td>
<td>Utilization and cost of non-ambulatory care: inpatient, emergency, and home care</td>
<td>↓ in condition related emergency, inpatient, and homecare care events (OR 0.64, P=0.001) and costs (53%, p&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open acess clinic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein et al 2009[13]</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>143 PD patients</td>
<td>Open access clinic</td>
<td>Mean number of hospitalisations per year, mean length of stay</td>
<td>50% ↓ in average number of PD admissions over 2 years: 36 to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PD medication choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grubb et al 2012[14]</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>7230 PD patients</td>
<td>Rasagiline versus dopamine agonists</td>
<td>Number of hospitalisation, duration of stay and costs</td>
<td>Fewer hospital admissions (OR 0.76, 95% CI 0.66-0.86), shorter length of stay and lower costs in rasagiline group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grubb et al 2013[15]</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>3864 PD patients</td>
<td>Rasagiline versus Selegiline</td>
<td>Hospitalisation, emergency room visits and falls</td>
<td>Lower emergency room visits (odds ratio: 0.79; 95% CI, 0.68 to 0.92), lower all hospital admissions (odds ratio: 0.82; 95% CI, 0.68 to 0.99), and lower number of falls in rasagiline group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Medication Adherence</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Sample Size (PD patients)</td>
<td>Adherence Measure</td>
<td>Outcomes Measure</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delea et al 2011[16]</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Adherence to levodopa/carbidopa/entacopone</td>
<td>All cause and PD-related hospitalisations, length of stay, emergency room and physicians visits, prescriptions and healthcare costs</td>
<td>Satisfactory adherence versus non adherent: mean number PD related admissions (0.15 vs 0.12, p&lt;0.001), emergency visits (0.04 vs 0.08, p=0.010), all cause hospitalisation (0.30 vs 0.53, p&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulkarni et al 2008[18]</td>
<td>Retrospective Longitudinal cohort</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>PD medication adherence</td>
<td>Medication adherence, PD related hospitalisations and emergency room visits.</td>
<td>Suboptimal adherence associated with worsening motor symptoms: Odds for adherers (MPR&gt;0.8) experiencing symptom worsening compared to non-adherers was 67% less (odd ratio 0.33 95% CI 0.13-0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei et al 2014[17]</td>
<td>Retrospective Crossectional study</td>
<td>7583</td>
<td>PD medication adherence</td>
<td>Hospital visits, emergency room visits, skilled nursing facility, home health agency, physicians visit and health costs</td>
<td>Prevalence and relative risk (low versus high adherers): hospitalisation 57% vs 47% and 1 versus 0.86 (95% CI 0.81-0.90), Emergency room visits 68% vs 59% and 1 versus 0.91(95% CI 0.86-0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis et al 2010[19]</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>PD medication adherence</td>
<td>Medication adherence, health care utilisation (including hospital admissions and emergency room visits), and costs</td>
<td>Mean hospitalisation per annum, non-compliant versus compliant: 2.3 versus 1.8; p&lt;0.005. Mean number of emergency departments visits were not significantly different 1.9 versus 1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Flow diagram showing publications identified through database searching and reasons for inclusion and exclusion from the review

Publications identified through database searching
n = 7610

Publications after duplicates removed
n=7361

Publications screened
n=7361

Publications excluded: n=7246
Reasons for exclusion:
- No abstracts
- Non-English language
- Addressed hospitalisation in other conditions including Schizophrenia, dementia, stroke,

Publications assessed for eligibility
n=115

Publications excluded n=105
Reasons for exclusion:
- Hospitalisation in PD but no interventions assessed

Publications included:
- Randomised controlled trials n=1
- Retrospective studies n=9
Highlights

- Hospitalisation in Parkinson’s disease (PD) is a significant cost driver.
- We reviewed the literature for interventions aimed at reducing hospitalisation in PD.
- There is a lack of robust evidence for interventions to reduce PD hospitalisation.
- Open access PD clinics, regular neurologist care and PD symptoms control may mitigate non-elective PD admissions.