

Effect of a simple exercise programme on hospitalisation-associated disability in older patients: a randomised controlled trial.

Authors: Javier Ortiz-Alonso^{1,2,3*}, Natalia Bustamante-Ara^{4*}, Pedro L. Valenzuela^{5*}, María T. Vidán^{1,2,3,6}, Gabriel Rodríguez-Romo^{3,7}, Jennifer Mayordomo-Cava^{2,3}, Marianna Javier-González¹, Mercedes Hidalgo-Gamarra¹, Myriel López-Tatis¹, María Isabel Valades-Malagón¹, Alejandro Santos-Lozano^{8,9}, Alejandro Lucia^{3,9,10}, José Antonio Serra-Rexach^{1,2,3,6}

* These authors contributed equally

Affiliations:

¹ Geriatric Department, Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón, Madrid, Spain.

² Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Gregorio Marañón, Madrid, Spain.

³ Biomedical Research Networking Centre on Frailty and Healthy Ageing, CIBERFES, Madrid, Spain.

⁴ Universidad Autónoma de Chile, Talca, Chile.

⁵ Systems Biology Department, University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain.

⁶ School of Medicine, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, Spain.

⁷ Sports Department, Instituto Nacional de Educación Física, Universidad Politécnica, Madrid, Spain.

⁸ i+HeALTH, European University Miguel de Cervantes, Valladolid, Spain.

⁹ Research Institute Hospital 12 de Octubre ('i+12'), Madrid, Spain.

¹⁰ Faculty of Sport Sciences, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Madrid, Spain.

Correspondence to: Javier Ortiz Alonso, MD.

Geriatric Service, Hospital General Universitario Gregorio
Marañón.

Calle Doctor Esquerdo, no.46, Madrid 28007, Spain.

Email: javier.ortiz@salud.madrid.org

Running title: Simple exercises against hospitalisation-associated disability.

Key words: Activities of daily living; functional decline; physical activity; geriatric assessment; hospitalisation; intervention.

Abstract word count: 287

Main text word count: 2427

References: 24

Figures and Tables: 2 Figure and 2 Tables

Funding information: This study was supported by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III (Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades, Spain) (RD12/0043/0025, PI12/02852, PI15/00558 and PI18/00139); Biomedical Research Networking Center on Frailty and Healthy Aging (CIBERFES, Spain); and FEDER funds from the European Union. The work of Pedro L. Valenzuela is supported by a contract granted by the University of Alcalá (FPI2016).

Acknowledgements: We sincerely thank the geriatrics ward team for their valuable help and contribution to our results, with a special mention to the following professionals: Alison Martínez, Jaqueline Ferrero, Mar Alonso, Laura Arribas, Laura Osuna, Reyes Vaquerizo, Cristina Cebollero, Yolanda Navarro, Soledad Rubio, Ana Ruiz, Saray Martínez, Raquel Moreno, María Angeles Flores, Lidia del Campo, Azucena Ríos, Antonio Piñeiro, Manuela Gámez, Piedad Trujillo, Mayte Mesa, Raquel Gutiérrez, Ana

M^a García, M^a Jesús Ruiz, Susana Palacios, Marta Orea, Ana Belén Huguet, Laura Jaro, Susana Robledo, José Lázaro.

Authors' contributions: Ortiz-Alonso, Bustamante-Ara, Vidán-Astiz, Rodriguez-Romo, Lucia and Serra-Rexach designed the work, acquired the data, and drafted the initial version of the manuscript. Valenzuela and Lucia analysed the data and drafted the final manuscript. Mayordomo-Cava, Javier-Gonzalez, Hidalgo-Gamarra, López-Tatis and Valades-Malagón contributed to the acquisition of data and revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. Santos-Lozano contributed to data analysis and revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. All the authors gave final approval of the final version and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Brief summary: A simple inpatient intervention consisting of walking and rising from a chair (~20 minutes/day) considerably decreases the risk of hospitalisation-associated disability in acutely hospitalised older patients.

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 *Objective:* Hospitalisation-associated disability (HAD, defined as the loss of ability to
3 perform one or more basic activities of daily living [ADL] independently at discharge) is
4 a frequent condition among older patients. The present study aimed to assess whether a
5 simple inpatient exercise programme decreases the incidence of HAD in acutely
6 hospitalised very old patients.

7 *Design:* In this randomized controlled trial (Activity in GERiatric acute CARE, AGE CAR)
8 participants were assigned to a control or intervention (exercise) group, and were assessed
9 at baseline, admission, discharge, and 3 months thereafter.

10 *Setting and participants:* 268 patients (mean age 88 years, range 75–102) admitted to an
11 acute care for elders (ACE) unit of a Public Hospital were randomized to a control
12 (n=125) or intervention (exercise) group (n=143).

13 *Methods:* Both groups received usual care, and patients in the intervention group also
14 performed simple supervised exercises (walking and rising from a chair, for a total daily
15 duration of ~20 min). We measured incident HAD at discharge and after 3 months
16 (primary outcome); and Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB), ambulatory
17 capacity, number of falls, re-hospitalisation and death during a 3-month follow-up
18 (secondary outcomes).

19 *Results:* Median duration of hospitalisation was 7 days (interquartile range 4 days).
20 Compared with admission, the intervention group had a lower risk of HAD at discharge
21 (odds ratio [OR]: 0.32; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.11–0.92) and at 3-months follow-
22 up (OR 0.24; 95% CI: 0.08–0.74) than controls during follow-up. No intervention effect
23 was noted for the other secondary endpoints (all $p > 0.05$), although a trend towards a lower
24 mortality risk was observed in the intervention group ($p = 0.078$).

25 *Conclusion and implications:* These findings demonstrate that a simple inpatient exercise
26 programme significantly decreases the risk of HAD in acutely hospitalised, very old
27 patients.

28 **Trial registration:** NCT0137489 (<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01374893>).

29

30 INTRODUCTION

31 Hospitalisation-associated disability (HAD, *i.e.*, loss of the ability to perform one or more
32 basic activities of daily living [ADL] independently at discharge) occurs in more than
33 one-third of hospitalised older adults.¹⁻⁴ This condition is associated with long-term
34 disability, institutionalisation and death,⁵⁻⁷ and therefore its prevention should be a
35 priority.

36 Hospitalised older patients spend most of the time in bed even if they are able to walk
37 independently,⁸ and the majority (73%) do not walk at all during hospitalisation.⁹ Several
38 physical strategies can be applied to prevent the functional decline associated with periods
39 of restricted mobility such as those imposed by hospitalisation, but physical exercise
40 appears the most effective.¹⁰ Exercise interventions have proven feasible and safe in
41 acutely hospitalised older medical patients, and are effective to improve their functional
42 status at discharge as well as to reduce the length and cost of hospital stays.¹¹⁻¹³ It has
43 been recommended that hospitalised old people should perform multicomponent exercise
44 programmes, that is, combining walking and resistance exercises.¹¹ However, this type of
45 intervention usually involves complex exercises and requires the purchase of weight-
46 training equipment, which might hinder its routine implementation in some Acute Care
47 of Elderly (ACE) units.

48 The aim of this study was to determine the effects of an inpatient exercise programme
49 including simple physical exercises for patients admitted to an ACE unit on: incident
50 HAD at discharge and at 3-months post-discharge (*primary endpoint*); and performance
51 on the Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB), independent-walking ability
52 (functional ambulatory classification [FAC]), and number of falls, re-hospitalisation and
53 mortality risk during the 3 months following discharge (*secondary endpoints*).

54 **METHODS**

55 **Study design**

56 This clinical trial (NCT01374893) complied with the recommendations of the
57 Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement.¹⁴ Patients (>75
58 years) admitted to our ACE unit (*Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón*,
59 Madrid) from June 2012 to June 2014 were considered eligible to participate in the study.
60 During these two years, the patients were eligible to be included in the control or
61 intervention group in a time-dependent manner (i.e., using 4- or 8-week blocks), to avoid
62 the co-presence of patients from both groups in the unit, such that the patients were
63 blinded to actual group assignment. We then excluded those who were non-ambulatory
64 or dependent in all basic ADL at baseline (i.e., 2 weeks before admission, assessed by
65 retrospective interview), had unstable cardiovascular disease or any other major medical
66 condition contraindicating exercise, terminal illness, severe dementia, an expected length
67 of hospitalisation <3 days, were transferred from another hospital unit, or had a scheduled
68 admission (which was usually associated with a length of hospitalisation <3 days). Only
69 those hospitalised for 3 or more days and alive at discharge were included. The
70 Institutional Review Board approved the protocol, and written informed consent was
71 obtained from patients. When it was not possible to obtain the informed consent directly
72 from a patient due to medical reasons (e.g., impaired cognitive function), proxy consent
73 was obtained from their relatives. All procedures were performed in accordance with the
74 ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments.
75 Both groups received standard care in our ACE unit.¹⁵

76 **Intervention**

77 The intervention (Monday to Friday) consisted solely of rising from a seated to an upright

78 position (using armrests/assistance if necessary) and supervised walking exercises (a
79 representative example of the exercises performed is available as **Supplementary**
80 **Material**). For the former, exercise loads increased individually and progressively from
81 1 to 3 sets of up to 10 repetitions, with a 2-minute rest between sets. When patients could
82 complete the prescribed training session (e.g., 1 set of 10 repetitions) in two consecutive
83 days, a new set was added, up to a maximum of 3 sets of 10 repetitions per session.
84 Walking total time progressed from 3 to 10 minutes (with resting periods if needed,
85 depending on the patient's condition) along the corridor of the ward with/without
86 assistance. Standing and walking exercises were separated by a rest period of up to 5
87 minutes. All the exercise sessions were supervised by a fitness specialist (NBA or GRR),
88 and training loads were recorded in a notebook.

89 **Endpoints**

90 The research staff included nurses, medical residents and the aforementioned fitness
91 specialists who were in charge of supervising each session. Those involved in outcome
92 assessment were not involved in supervising the intervention. However, assessors and
93 care providers were not blinded to the assigned intervention. The ability to perform basic
94 ADL, the SPPB,¹⁶ and the modified FAC¹⁷ were assessed in-hospital on admission and
95 on discharge. Basic ADLs and FAC were also assessed retrospectively to analyse baseline
96 status, as well as by telephone interview 3-months post-discharge. HAD was considered
97 as a dichotomous variable attending to whether the patient had lost or not the ability to
98 perform one or more ADL independently, and was assessed at discharge and 3 months
99 later.¹ The basic ADL included for HAD assessment were bathing, dressing, toileting,
100 transferring, continence and eating.¹⁸ We also assessed the loss of independent ambulation
101 at discharge and three months later. This was determined according to the modified FAC,
102 which classifies patients in five different categories attending to their level of dependence

103 during walking: a score of 0 was assigned if the patient could not walk, 1 if the patient
104 required continuous manual contact to support the body, 2 for light or intermittent manual
105 contact to assist balance, 3 for independent but supervised ambulation, and 4 for
106 independent ambulation on level surfaces or stairs.¹⁷ Thus, a FAC score <4 was
107 considered the threshold for independent ambulation.¹⁷ Mortality and number of falls
108 during post-discharge follow-up were recorded by telephone interview.

109 Although the original protocol specified a change in SPPB score as the primary
110 endpoint,¹⁴ an interim analysis after 4 months revealed that 94% (intervention) and 84%
111 (controls) of patients had an SPPB score <6 on a 0–12 scale, masking a potential
112 intervention effect. Accordingly, we considered that the intervention effects would not be
113 noticeable in a test such as the SPPB given the very low physical performance capacity
114 of the study participants, whereas ability to perform basic ADL might be more responsive
115 to the intervention in this patient group. Thus, HAD was established as the primary
116 endpoint.

117 **Statistical analysis**

118 Prior (unpublished) data obtained in 604 patients showed that 33% of the patients
119 admitted to our ACE unit improved in one or more ADL from admission to discharge. As
120 we hoped to increase this rate by 15% with the intervention (up to 48%), we estimated a
121 sample of 260 or more patients to detect a significant intervention effect on incident HAD
122 (power=80%, $\alpha=0.05$).

123 Data are presented as mean±standard deviation (SD). Normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk
124 test) and homoscedasticity (Levene's test) of the data were checked before any statistical
125 treatment. Groups were compared using Student's independent or chi-square tests for
126 continuous or dichotomous variables, respectively. Binary logistic regression was used to

127 compare the risk of HAD, frailty (SPPB score <9), independent ambulation, re-
128 hospitalisation and death between groups. Survival analysis (crude and adjusted Kaplan-
129 Meier) was performed during the 3-month follow-up. Incidence rate ratio (IRR,
130 calculated with negative binomial regression) was used to compare the number of falls
131 between groups. We did not impute missing data, and thus only available data was used
132 for analysis for each specific variable. All statistical analyses were conducted using a
133 statistical software package (SPSS 23.0, IBM, NY) with $\alpha=0.05$.

134 **RESULTS**

135 A flow diagram of study participants is shown in **figure 1**. From a total of 1110 patients
136 admitted to our ACE unit during the study period, 281 met all inclusion criteria and
137 volunteered to participate. Of these, 131 and 150 were assigned to the control and the
138 intervention group, respectively. Finally, 268 patients (n=143 and 125 for intervention
139 and control, respectively) completed the study and could be included in the analysis. No
140 between-group differences were found at the start of the study for most
141 sociodemographic/clinical variables, but those in the intervention arm were overall more
142 dependent in ADL function, both at baseline (i.e., 2 weeks before admission, assessed by
143 retrospective interview) and admission (**Table 1**). The median length of hospitalisation
144 was 7 days (interquartile range [IQR] 4), with no between-group differences (p=0.246).
145 Median duration of the exercise intervention was 3 days (IQR 2), with an average total
146 exercise time per day of ~20 min (the median duration of the walking part was 5 min
147 [IQR 4, range 0 to 10] and patients performed a mean of 9 [SD 6, range 0 to 30] sit to
148 stands). No adverse effects or falls were recorded during the intervention. Five (3.5%)
149 patients did not exercise because they had a rapid, severe functional decline shortly after
150 admission.

151 Compared with admission, patients in the exercise group had a significantly lower risk of
152 HAD than their controls both at discharge and at 3-months post-discharge, even when
153 adjusting for clinical characteristics and functional performance at admission (**Table 2**),
154 with the proportion of patients diagnosed with HAD significantly lower in the former at
155 both time points ($p=0.012$ and 0.003 for discharge and 3-month post-discharge,
156 respectively). Compared with baseline, however, the proportion of patients with HAD did
157 not differ between groups at discharge (56% and 58% for the intervention and control
158 group, respectively; $p=0.685$) or 3 months later (53% and 62%, respectively; $p=0.188$).
159 Also, no intervention effect was noted at discharge for the SPPB (3.6 ± 2.5 and 4.2 ± 3.1 for
160 the intervention and control group, respectively; $p=0.108$) and FAC score (2.8 ± 1.2 and
161 2.9 ± 1.3 , respectively; $p=0.404$), or for risk of re-hospitalisation or number of falls during
162 the 3-month follow-up (0.44 ± 1.47 [median: 0, range: 0, 10] and 0.70 ± 1.70 [median: 0,
163 range: 0, 10]) (**Table 2**). A non-significant trend towards a lower mortality risk was
164 observed in the intervention group, with crude and adjusted Kaplan-Meier analysis
165 confirming this trend ($p=0.084$ and 0.085 , respectively) (**figure 2**).

166 **DISCUSSION**

167 HAD is a frequent condition among hospitalised older adults that has major negative
168 consequences for patients and caregivers.¹ Our finding that performing simple inpatient
169 exercises (solely walking and rising from a chair) considerably decreases (by ~70%) the
170 risk of HAD in acutely hospitalised patients of advanced age (mean of 88 years), the
171 majority also being frail, is thus important. Accordingly, our results support the routine
172 implementation of these exercises during the acute hospitalisation of older patients.

173 Results of different systematic reviews indicate that inpatient exercise programmes are
174 safe and overall effective in hospitalised older patients.¹¹⁻¹³ However, not all types of

175 exercise interventions are easily feasible in this population owing to a frequently limited
176 mobility capacity. Walking during hospital stay has proven to maintain pre-
177 hospitalisation mobility, but conflicting results have been reported regarding its benefits
178 on ADL function.^{19,20} By contrast, the combination of walking with lower limb
179 strengthening exercises can provide greater benefits on functional ability.^{21,22} Indeed,
180 walking combined with stretching/strengthening exercises (*e.g.*, leg lifts/swings, toe/heel
181 raises) is associated with a better ADL function at 1-month post-discharge.²¹ A recent
182 study reported that a combination of walking, balance, and resistance exercises during a
183 median of 5 days provided significant benefits in the functional ability of older patients
184 during acute hospitalisation.²² But, the aforementioned intervention was more complex
185 than the present protocol and required specific weight-training equipment,²² which might
186 hinder routine implementation in some ACE units.

187 Although sedentary behaviours (such as those commonly observed in hospitalised
188 patients⁸) are associated with an increased incidence of frailty in older adults, the
189 inclusion of a low amount of physical activity moderates (or even completely offsets if
190 performed for >27 minutes) this relationship,²³ which reinforces the need of increasing
191 physical activity levels regardless of the specific exercise performed. In further support
192 of the effectiveness of simple exercises against sedentary behaviours and the consequent
193 functional decline, Harvey et al. recently reported that encouraging frequent but small
194 bouts of exercise (*i.e.*, rising from a chair) might suffice to reduce functional decline in
195 frail sheltered housing residents.²⁴ It is reasonable to hypothesise that, as in healthy older
196 adults, a dose-response relationship likely exists between training intensity and exercise
197 benefits.²⁵ However, our results suggest that walking for up to 10 minutes and standing
198 up from a chair (gradually increasing exercise loads by increasing the total number of
199 repetitions [until a maximum of 30/day] and providing external help during the movement

200 if needed) might induce clinically meaningful benefits in the case of frail older patients
201 such as those studied here. That said, this type of intervention requires close supervision
202 and thus an additional time involvement of the hospital staff with respect to their daily
203 duties or reliance on external staff, as described here (i.e., fitness specialists).

204 Several potential limitations should be considered. Groups initially differed in functional
205 and mental status as well as in falls history, which might have potentially biased the
206 outcomes. In this respect, however, the benefits of the intervention on the risk of incident
207 HAD remained significant even after adjusting for clinical and functional variables at
208 admission. The losses during the follow-up (up to ~20% of participants for some
209 endpoints such as FAC) should also be borne in mind as a limitation. Also, our study is a
210 single-centre study performed in a very old and frail population, which could limit the
211 generalisability of our findings to younger or more functional patients. The small
212 proportion (~25%) of the total number of hospitalised patients in our ACE unit that
213 participated in our study possibly (partly due to the strict inclusion criteria) lends further
214 support to the idea that the present results might not be necessarily applicable to acutely
215 hospitalised old patients in general. On the other hand, although this intervention did not
216 require investment in weight-training equipment, the additional time commitment needed
217 from the hospital staff to supervise the exercise sessions (or alternatively the need to rely
218 on external staff such as fitness specialists, as we did here) are issues that should be
219 addressed in future research, for instance in studies aiming to assess the cost effectiveness
220 of the present type of intervention. It must also be noted that no intervention benefits were
221 observed when HAD was analysed with respect to baseline (i.e., 2 weeks before
222 admission). Finally, the greater functional independence of the control group at baseline
223 could have potentially influenced the results, as the patients of this group might have
224 tended to more rapidly recover their “normal” physical status during hospitalisation even

225 in the absence of an exercise intervention.

226 **CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

227 A simple inpatient exercise programme solely consisting of walking and rising from a
228 chair (median duration of the intervention only 3 days, ~20 minutes/day) decreases the
229 incidence of HAD in acutely hospitalised, very old patients. Further research is needed to
230 analyse the cost-effectiveness of this type of intervention (in terms of staff resources) and
231 its generalisability. However, given the clinical relevance of HAD, our results support the
232 routine implementation of these exercises during the acute hospitalisation of older
233 patients.

234 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

235 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

236 **REFERENCES**

- 237 1. Covinsky KE, Pierluissi E, Story THEPS. Hospitalization-Associated Disability
238 “She Was Probably Able to Ambulate, but I’m Not Sure”. *JAMA*.
239 2011;306(16):1782–1793.
- 240 2. Gill TM, Allore HG, Holford TR, Guo Z. Hospitalization, restricted activity, and
241 the development of disability among older persons. *JAMA*. 2004;292(17):2115–
242 2124. doi:10.1001/jama.292.17.2115
- 243 3. Gill TM, Allore HG, Gahbauer E, Murphy T. Change in disability after
244 hospitalization or restricted activity in older persons. *JAMA*. 2010;304(17):1919–
245 1928. doi:10.1001/jama.2010.1568.CHANGE
- 246 4. Covinsky KE, Palmer RM, Fortinsky RH, Counsell SR, Stewart AL, Kresevic D.

- 247 Loss of Independence in Activities of Daily Living in Older Adults Hospitalized
248 with Medical Illnesses : Increased Vulnerability with Age. *J Am Geriatr Soc.*
249 2003;51(4):451–458.
- 250 5. Boyd C, Landefeld C, Counsell S, u. a. Recovery in Activities of Daily Living
251 Among Older Adults Following Hospitalization for Acute Medical Illness. *J Am*
252 *Geriatr Soc.* 2008;56(12):2171–2179. doi:10.1111/j.1532-
253 5415.2008.02023.x.Recovery
- 254 6. Inouye SK, Peduzzi PN, Robison JT, Hughes JS, Horwitz RI, Concato J.
255 Importance of functional measures in predicting mortality among older
256 hospitalized patients. *JAMA.* 1998;279(15):1187–1198.
257 doi:10.1001/jama.279.15.1187
- 258 7. Fortinsky RH, Covinsky KE, Palmer RM, Landefeld CS. Effects of functional
259 status changes before and during hospitalization on nursing home admission of
260 older adults. *Journals Gerontol - Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 1999;54(10):521–526.
261 doi:10.1093/gerona/54.10.M521
- 262 8. Brown CJ, Redden DT, Flood KL, Allman RM. The underrecognized epidemic
263 of low mobility during hospitalization of older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc.*
264 2009;57(9):1660–1665. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2009.02393.x
- 265 9. Callen BL, Mahoney JE, Grieves CB, Wells TJ, Enloe M. Frequency of hallway
266 ambulation by hospitalized older adults on medical units of an academic hospital.
267 *Geriatr Nurs (Minneap).* 2004;25(4):212–217.
268 doi:10.1016/j.gerinurse.2004.06.016
- 269 10. Valenzuela PL, Morales JS, Pareja-Galeano H, u. a. Physical strategies to prevent

- 270 disuse-induced functional decline in the elderly. *Ageing Res Rev.*
271 2018;47(July):80–88. doi:10.1016/J.ARR.2018.07.003
- 272 11. Martínez-Velilla N, Cadore EL, Casas-Herrero, Idoate-Saralegui F, Izquierdo M.
273 Physical activity and early rehabilitation in hospitalized elderly medical patients:
274 Systematic review of randomized clinical trials. *J Nutr Heal Aging.*
275 2016;20(7):738–751. doi:10.1007/s12603-016-0683-4
- 276 12. Bachmann S, Finger C, Huss A, Egger M, Stuck AE, Clough-Gorr KM. Inpatient
277 rehabilitation specifically designed for geriatric patients: Systematic review and
278 meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ.* 2010;340(7758):1230.
279 doi:10.1136/bmj.c1718
- 280 13. Kosse NM, Dutmer AL, Dasenbrock L, Bauer JM, Lamoth CJC. Effectiveness
281 and feasibility of early physical rehabilitation programs for geriatric hospitalized
282 patients: A systematic review. *BMC Geriatr.* 2013;13(1). doi:10.1186/1471-
283 2318-13-107
- 284 14. Fleck SJ, Bustamante-Ara N, Ortiz J, Vidán MT, Lucia A, Serra-Rexach JA.
285 Activity in GERiatric acute CARE (AGECAR): Rationale, design and methods.
286 *BMC Geriatr.* 2012;12:12–28. doi:10.1186/1471-2318-12-28
- 287 15. Vidán MT, Sánchez E, Alonso M, Montero B, Ortiz J, Serra JA. An intervention
288 integrated into daily clinical practice reduces the incidence of delirium during
289 hospitalization in elderly patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2009;57(11):2029–2036.
290 doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2009.02485.x
- 291 16. Guralnik JM, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L, u. a. A Short Physical performance
292 Battery Assessing Lower Extremity Function: Association With Self-Reported

- 293 Disability and Prediction of Mortality and Nursing Home Admission. *J Gerontol*
294 *Med Sci.* 1994;49(2):M85–M94.
- 295 17. Holden MK, Gill KM, Magliozzi MR, Nathan J, Piehl-baker L. Clinical gait
296 assessment in the neurologically impaired. Reliability and meaningfulness. *Phys*
297 *Ther.* 1984;64(1):35–40. doi:10.1093/ptj/64.1.35
- 298 18. Katz S, Ford A, Moskowitz R, Jackson B, Jaffe M. Studies of illness in the aged.
299 The index of ADL: a standardized measure of biological and psychological
300 function. *JAMA.* 1963;185:914–918.
- 301 19. Brown CJ, Foley KT, Lowman JD, et al. Comparison of posthospitalization
302 function and community mobility in hospital mobility program and usual care
303 patients a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2016;176(7):921–927.
304 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.1870
- 305 20. Padula CA, Hughes C, Baumhover L. Impact of a nurse-driven mobility protocol
306 on functional decline in hospitalized older adults. *J Nurs Care Qual.*
307 2009;24(4):325–331. doi:10.1097/NCQ.0b013e3181a4f79b
- 308 21. Siebens H, Aronow H, Edwards D, Ghasemi Z. A randomized controlled trial of
309 exercise to improve outcomes of acute hospitalization in older adults. *J Am*
310 *Geriatr Soc.* 2000;48:1545–1546.
- 311 22. Martínez-Velilla N, Casas-Herrero N, Zambon-Ferraresi F, et al. Effect of
312 Exercise Intervention on Functional Decline in Very Elderly Patients During
313 Acute Hospitalization: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med.*
314 2019;179(1):28–36.

- 315 23. Mañas A, Pozo-Cruz B del, Rodríguez-Gómez I, u. a. Can Physical Activity
316 Offset the Detrimental Consequences of Sedentary Time on Frailty? A
317 Moderation Analysis in 749 Older Adults Measured With Accelerometers. *J Am*
318 *Med Dir Assoc.* 2019;In press. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2018.12.012
- 319 24. Harvey JA, Chastin SFM, Skelton DA. Breaking sedentary behaviour has the
320 potential to increase / maintain function in frail older adults. *J Frailty,*
321 *Sarcopenia Falls.* 2018;03(01):26–34. doi:10.22540/jfsf-03-026
- 322 25. Borde R, Hortobágyi T, Granacher U. Dose–Response Relationships of
323 Resistance Training in Healthy Old Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-
324 Analysis. *Sport Med.* 2015;45(12):1693–1720. doi:10.1007/s40279-015-0385-9
- 325 26. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, u. a. Frailty in Older Adults: Evidence for a
326 Phenotype. *Journals Gerontol Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2001;56(3):M146–M157.
327 doi:10.1093/gerona/56.3.M146
- 328 27. Bandinelli S, Lauretani F, Boscherini V, u. a. A randomized, controlled trial of
329 disability prevention in frail older patients screened in primary care: the FRASI
330 Study. Design and baseline evaluation. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2009;18(5):359–366.
331
332

333 **Table 1.** Baseline, admission and main in-hospital characteristics by group

Variable	Control (N=125)	Exercise (N=143)	p-value
Age (mean ± SD), years	88 ± 5	88 ± 5	0.88
Women	54%	60%	0.28
Body mass index (mean ± SD), kg/m²	26.0 ± 6.4	26.1 ± 9.3	0.95
Living at home	93%	91%	0.57
Charlson comorbidity index (mean ± SD)	6.8 ± 1.9	6.7 ± 1.7	0.88
Geriatric syndromes			
Dementia	12%	27%	0.003
Depression	18%	32%	0.010
Falls	16%	36%	<0.001
Chronic pain	30%	35%	0.43
Malnutrition	14%	22%	0.085
Urinary incontinence	39%	49%	0.11
Frailty phenotype ^a	65%	74%	0.097
Incident delirium	18%	28%	0.81
Polypharmacy (≥7)	55%	58%	0.64
Main admission diagnosis			0.39
Respiratory	26%	34%	
Circulatory	30%	26%	
Renal/urologic	15%	8%	
Central nervous system	7%	13%	
Digestive	7%	8%	
Independence in basic ADLs at baseline^b			
Full function (>4 ADLs)	62%	50%	0.036
Moderate impairment (3–4 ADLs)	22%	24%	0.58
Severe impairment (<3 ADLs)	16%	26%	0.049
Independent ambulation at baseline (FAC <4)	76%	68%	0.14
Independence in basic ADLs at admission^b			
Full function (>4 ADLs)	30%	18%	0.019
Moderate impairment (3–4 ADLs)	25%	21%	0.46
Severe impairment (<3 ADLs)	45%	61%	0.009
Independent ambulation (FAC <4) at admission	40%	31%	0.13
SPPB (mean ±SD), score at admission	3.8 ± 2.9	3.2 ± 2.5	0.078
Length of hospitalization (median [IQR]), days	7 (5)	6 (4)	0.25

334

335 Abbreviations: ADLs, activities of daily living; FAC, functional ambulation category; IQR,
336 interquartile range; SPPB, short physical performance battery.

337 ^a Frailty was defined as having ≥3 of 5 Fried's criteria.²⁶

338 ^b The 6 basic ADLs assessed were bathing, dressing, transferring, toileting, continence and
339 feeding. Significant differences between groups (p<0.05) are in bold.

Table 2. Effects of hospitalization on study endpoints

	Control group (N=125)		Exercise group (N=143)		Binary logistic regression/Negative binomial regression ^d	
	N with actual data for analyses for each endpoint	Cases (%)	N with actual data for analyses for each endpoint	Cases (%)	Crude (95% CI)	Adjusted ^e (95% CI)
At discharge						
HAD ^a	125	21%	143	10%	OR: 0.41 (0.21, 0.83) p=0.013	OR: 0.32 (0.11, 0.92) p=0.035
SPPB score <9 _b	115	90%	134	96%	OR: 2.26 (0.81, 6.31) p=0.12	OR: 0.96 (0.16, 5.75) p=0.96
Dependent ambulation ^c	125	50%	143	61%	OR: 1.53 (0.94, 2.48) p=0.087	OR: 0.66 (0.28, 1.60) p=0.66
3-months post-discharge						
HAD	102	41%	123	24%	OR: 0.51 (0.27, 0.98) p=0.043	OR: 0.24 (0.08, 0.74) p=0.013
Dependent ambulation	94	45%	123	58%	OR: 1.69 (0.98, 2.90) p=0.057	OR: 0.77 (0.34, 1.76) p=0.54
Re- hospitalisation	125	22%	143	24%	OR: 1.12 (0.64, 1.98) p=0.69	OR: 1.17 (0.49, 2.79) p=0.72
Number of falls*	106	–	125	–	IRR: 0.98 (0.87, 1.08) p=0.678	IRR: 0.98 (0.86, 1.14) p=0.678
Mortality	125	10%	143	4%	OR: 0.41 (0.15, 1.13) p=0.086	OR: 0.09 (0.01, 1.32) p=0.078

^a HAD refers to the loss of ability to perform one or more basic activities of daily living independently compared with admission

^b An SPPB score <9 has been reported as an indicator of frailty.²⁷

^c Dependent ambulation was considered as a Functional Ambulation Category [FAC] <4.¹⁷

^d The control group was used as reference for regression analyses; except for number of falls (analysed with negative binomial regression), binary logistic regression was used for the remainder of endpoints.


^e Adjusted for sex, age, body mass index, living or not at home, Charlson index, polypharmacy (>7), comorbidities, cause of hospitalisation (admission diagnosis) and physical function at admission (including Katz score, independent ambulation or not, and having a SPPB score <9 or not).


Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HAD, hospitalisation-associated disability; IRR, incidence rate ratio; OR, odds ratio. Significant (p<0.05) OR values are in bold.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Flowchart of study participants. Abbreviations: AMI, acute myocardial infarction.

Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis.





Number at risk						
—	Control Group	125	124	122	119	116
- - -	Exercise Group	143	142	141	137	137