

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Do Rehospitalization Rates Differ Among Injury Severity Levels in the NIDRR Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Program?



Risa Nakase-Richardson, PhD,^{a,d,e} Johanna Tran, MD,^{b,f} David Cifu, MD,^{g,h}
Scott D. Barnett, PhD,^{c,d} Lawrence J. Horn, MD,ⁱ Brian D. Greenwald, MD,^{j,k}
Robert C. Brunner, MD,^l John Whyte, MD, PhD,^m Flora M. Hammond, MD,^{n,o}
Stuart A. Yablon, MD,^{p,q} Joseph T. Giacino, PhD^{j,r}

From the ^aDivision of MHSB, ^bInternal Medicine, ^cResearch, James A. Haley Veterans Hospital, Tampa, FL; ^dCenter of Excellence for Maximizing Rehabilitation Outcomes, Tampa, FL; ^eDepartment of Psychology, ^fDepartment of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL; ^gDivision of PMRS, Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Hospital, Richmond, VA; ^hDepartment of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA; ⁱDepartment of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI; ^jCenter for Head Injuries, JFK-Johnson Rehabilitation Institute, ^kDepartment of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Edison, NJ; ^lDepartment of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Alabama, Birmingham, AL; ^mMoss Rehabilitation Research Institute, Elkins Park, PA; ⁿCarolinas Rehabilitation, Charlotte, NC; ^oDepartment of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN; ^pGlenrose Rehabilitation Hospital, Edmonton, AB, Canada; ^qDivision of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada; and ^rDepartment of Rehabilitation Neuropsychology, Spaulding Rehabilitation Hospital, Boston, MA.

Abstract

Objective: To compare the rate and nature of rehospitalization in a cohort of patients enrolled in the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems (TBIMS) who have disorders of consciousness (DOC) at the time of rehabilitation admission with those in persons with moderate or severe traumatic brain injury (TBI) but without DOC at rehabilitation admission.

Design: Prospective observational study.

Setting: Inpatient rehabilitation within TBIMS with annual follow-up.

Participants: Of 9028 persons enrolled from 1988 to 2009 (N = 9028), 366 from 20 centers met criteria for DOC at rehabilitation admission and follow-up data, and another 5132 individuals met criteria for moderate (n = 769) or severe TBI (n = 4363).

Interventions: Not applicable.

Main Outcome Measures: Participants and/or their family members completed follow-up data collection including questions about frequency and nature of rehospitalizations at 1 year postinjury. For the subset of participants with DOC, additional follow-up was conducted at 2 and 5 years postinjury.

Results: The DOC group demonstrated an overall 2-fold increase in rehospitalization in the first year postinjury relative to those with moderate or severe TBI without DOC. Persons with DOC at rehabilitation admission have a higher rate of rehospitalization across several categories than persons with moderate or severe TBI.

Conclusions: Although the specific details of rehospitalization are unknown, greater injury severity resulting in DOC status on rehabilitation admission has long-term implications. Data highlight the need for a longitudinal approach to patient management.

Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation 2013;94:1884-90

© 2013 by the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine

Nakase-Richardson has changed affiliation from the study site where the study maintains institutional review board approval (Methodist Rehabilitation Center, Jackson, MS).

Supported by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, United States Department of Education (grant nos. H133A060038 [TBI Model System National Data and Statistical Center], H133A070036 [Virginia Commonwealth TBI Model System], H133A-080044 [Southeastern Michigan TBI System], H133A070083 [Mount Sinai School of Medicine], H133A070039 [University of Alabama TBIMS], H133A070040 [Moss TBI Model System], H133A070042 [Carolinas Traumatic Brain Injury Rehabilitation and Research System], H133A070027 [North Texas TBI Model System], H133A120085 [Spaulding-Harvard TBI Model System]). The contents of the article do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and endorsement by the Federal Government should not be assumed. Statistical support provided by the Health Services Research and Development/Rehabilitation Research and Development Center of Excellence for Maximizing Rehabilitation Outcomes (grant no. COE – HFP 09-156).

The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Uniformed Services University, the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, or the United States Government.

No commercial party having a direct financial interest in the results of the research supporting this article has conferred or will confer a benefit on the authors or on any organization with which the authors are associated (Nakase-Richardson, Tran, Cifu, Barnett, Horn, Greenwald, Brunner, Whyte, Hammond, Yablon).

A commercial party having a direct financial interest in the results of the research supporting this article has conferred or will confer a financial benefit on 1 or more of the authors. Giacino provided expert witness testimony regarding the same patient population within the last 12 months.

With ongoing advances in health care service delivery, a greater number of those with the most neurologically devastating brain injuries are surviving. These severely injured patients include those with disorders of consciousness (DOC), including coma, vegetative state (VS), and minimally conscious state (MCS). Although mortality rates vary for the DOC subpopulations, there is sparse scientific knowledge regarding the longitudinal medical course of individuals with DOC.¹⁻⁹ Patients with moderate to severe traumatic brain injury (TBI) experience higher rates of complications such as pneumonia, seizures, and suicide.^{10,11} Studies of all TBI rehabilitation admissions demonstrate an annual incidence of rehospitalization of approximately 15% to 20% for the first 5 years after injury.^{12,13} Common readmission reasons in declining order of frequency include orthopedic or reconstructive procedures, general health maintenance, infections, seizures, and psychiatric disorders. However, these studies did not differentiate the rate or nature of complications experienced by patients with TBI and persistent DOC.

Speculation exists that individuals with greater TBI injury severity (ie, persistent DOC) may require specialized expertise in acute and postacute stages of recovery. Ongoing recovery as well as medical complications may require rehospitalization to access specific specialties. However, it is not clear whether patients with DOC have unique medical and rehabilitation needs. A better understanding of the incidence and types of rehospitalization for different levels of injury severity would help elucidate the unique needs for those with the greatest level of injury severity to optimize their long-term care, to minimize complications, and to enhance functional recovery.

This cross-sectional investigation uses a secondary analysis of a prospective, multicenter, longitudinal dataset to assess rate and types of rehospitalization in the first year postinjury for individuals with moderate, severe, and DOC TBI admitted to inpatient neurorehabilitation. Additionally, rehospitalization rates were examined for the DOC cohort during years 2 and 5 postinjury, with anticipation that individuals with DOC have greater utilization of services. Lastly, implications for further research and clinical management are discussed.

Methods

Participants

Participants were enrolled prospectively in the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) TBI Model Systems (TBIMS) national database, a multicenter longitudinal

study of TBI outcomes. Currently, there are 16 sites across the country enrolling subjects in the database, which has been in existence since 1988. Criteria for the NIDRR TBIMS program include the following: (1) medically documented TBI; (2) treatment at an affiliated level I trauma center within 24 hours of injury; (3) receipt of inpatient rehabilitation within the Model System; (4) admission to inpatient rehabilitation within 72 hours of discharge from acute care; (5) age ≥ 16 years at the time of injury; and (6) provision of informed consent by the person with injury or a legal proxy.¹⁴ Study-specific inclusion criteria included moderate to severe TBI. Individuals with moderate TBI were defined by an emergency department (ED) Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score of 9 to 12, and the ability to follow commands on rehabilitation admission. Individuals with severe TBI were defined by an ED GCS score of 3 to 8, and the ability to follow commands on rehabilitation admission. To identify persons with DOC, the following previously published criteria¹⁵ were used: (1) unconscious on rehabilitation admission (ie, no prior observation of 2 consecutive days of command-following from acute care record review); (2) GCS motor score < 6 on rehabilitation admission (item derived from the Disability Rating Scale [DRS] assessment obtained on rehabilitation admission); and (3) eligibility for at least 1 year of follow-up. Exclusion criteria for DOC included (1) individuals with missing command-following data (ie, duration of unconsciousness) from acute care records; and (2) individuals with missing GCS motor scores on rehabilitation admission. Additional exclusion criteria included (1) mild injury (ED GCS score, 13–15); and (2) no follow-up interview with TBI survivor or family member. A follow-up interview was attempted for participants living in alternative settings (eg, nursing homes) to maximize the representativeness of the follow-up data. All TBIMS participants provided informed consent directly or by legal proxy.

Measures

TBIMS form 2 follow-up question regarding rehospitalization (2004–2012)

The wording varied depending on the timing of the follow-up call. At the 1-year injury anniversary, the participant was asked, “Since your discharge from the rehab center have you stayed overnight in a hospital because you were ill or injured?” while on the subsequent year 2 and 5 follow-up interviews the individual was asked, “In the past year, have you stayed overnight in a hospital because you were ill or injured?” Before 2004, the TBIMS made annual calls as opposed to skipping from year 2 to year 5, and thus, at that time the participants were asked, “Since your last evaluation (data collection call) have you stayed overnight in a hospital because you were ill or injured?”

If the answer to the question is “yes,” ask for each admission: “What was the reason for your admission?”

Examples within each rehospitalization category are provided in table 1. Trained research assistants then code hospitalizations into the following categories: 0, rehabilitation (inpatient); 1, seizures; 2, neurologic disorder (nonseizure); 3, psychiatric; 4, infectious; 5, orthopedic; 6, general health maintenance; 7, other (not specified elsewhere); 8, not applicable (no rehospitalization/no further rehospitalizations); 9, rehospitalized (reason unknown); 99, unknown.

Procedure

Trained TBIMS research assistants collected information regarding injury severity (GCS, time to follow commands [TFC]) from hospital and emergency medical service records. Demographic

List of abbreviations:

CI	confidence interval
DOC	disorders of consciousness
DRS	Disability Rating Scale
ED	emergency department
GCS	Glasgow Coma Scale
IRR	incidence rate ratio
LSM	least squares mean
MCS	minimally conscious state
NIDRR	National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research
TBI	traumatic brain injury
TBIMS	TBI Model Systems
TFC	time to follow commands
VS	vegetative state

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/3448614>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/3448614>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)