

1 RESEARCH ARTICLE

2 The effects of physiotherapy programs in COVID-19 patients during  
3 admission in the hospital.

4  
5 **Netchanok Jianramas<sup>1,2</sup>, Veeranoot Nissapatorn<sup>3</sup>, Chaisith Sivakorn<sup>4</sup>, Maria de Lourdes**  
6 **Pereira<sup>5</sup>, Anuttra (Chaovavanich) Ratnarathon<sup>6</sup>, Chenpak Salesingh<sup>7</sup>, Eittipad Jaiyen<sup>7</sup>,**  
7 **Salinee Chaiyakul<sup>1,2</sup>, Nitita Piya-amornphan<sup>1,2</sup>, Thanaporn Semphuet<sup>1,2</sup>, Thanrada**  
8 **Thiangtham<sup>1,2</sup>, Kornchanok Boontam<sup>1,2</sup>, Khomkrip Longlalerng<sup>1,2\*</sup>**

9  
10 **1** Department of Physical Therapy, School of Allied Health Sciences, Walailak University,  
11 Nakhon Si Thammarat, Thailand, **2** Movement Science and Exercise Research Center-  
12 Walailak University (MoveSE-WU), **3** Department of Medical Technology, School of Allied  
13 Health Sciences, Walailak University, Nakhon Si Thammarat, Thailand, **4** Intensive Care Unit,  
14 University College London Hospitals, London, United Kingdom, **5** CICECO-Aveiro Institute  
15 of Materials & Department of Medical Sciences, University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro,  
16 Portugal, **6** Pulmonologist, Bamrasnaradura Infectious Disease Institute, Nonthaburi, Thailand,  
17 **7** Physical Therapy Department, Bamrasnaradura Infectious Disease Institute, Nonthaburi,  
18 Thailand

19 \* Corresponding author: [klugklig016@gmail.com](mailto:klugklig016@gmail.com)

20  
21 **Data Availability Statement:** All relevant data are within the manuscript and its [Supporting](#)  
22 [information](#) files.

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

23 **Fundings:** The Health Systems Research Institute of Thailand (HSRI-64-184). Project  
24 CICECO-Aveiro Institute of Materials, UIDB/50011/2020, UIDP/50011/2020 &  
25 LA/P/0006/2020, financed by national funds through the FCT/MEC (PIDDAC).

26 **Competing interests:** Authors declare no conflict of interest relating to this work.

27

## 28 **Abstract**

### 29 **Background and aims**

30 Several recommendations exist regarding the role of physiotherapy programs (PTPs) in  
31 COVID-19 patients. However, none of the studies examines the frequency of bedside PTPs  
32 during admission. Thus, this study aimed to compare the different bedside PTPs frequencies  
33 on the survival rate, length of hospitalization (LoH), referrals to the intensive care unit (ICU),  
34 and in-hospital complications. The safety of patients and the physiotherapist was also  
35 investigated.

### 36 **Methods**

37 Fifty-two COVID-19 patients were equally assigned into two groups matched on gender and  
38 age (1:1 ratio). Experimental group one received 1-2 times of PTPs during hospitalization, and  
39 experimental group two received daily PTPs until hospital discharge. The primary outcomes  
40 were the survival rate, LoH, referrals to ICU, and in-hospital complications. The secondary  
41 outcomes were the adverse events for patients and the number of physiotherapists who  
42 contracted with COVID-19.

43

44

## 45 **Results**

46 Most participants were classified as having mild to moderate COVID-19 with a mean age of  
47 45 years. There were no differences between groups in all primary outcome measures (all  $p >$   
48 0.05). The overall survival rate was 98%. One participant from the Ex-G2 group was referred  
49 to the ICU. Two Ex-G1 and four Ex-G2 participants had complications. There were no  
50 immediate serious adverse events found after PTPs for both groups. None of the  
51 physiotherapists tested positive for COVID-19.

## 52 **Conclusion**

53 In COVID-19 patients with mild to moderate conditions, one to two bedside PTPs were enough  
54 to achieve the same results as patients who received daily PTPs. PTPs were safe for COVID-  
55 19 patients, and physiotherapists.

56 **CLINICAL REGISTRATION NUMBER:** Thai Clinical Trials, <https://www.thaiclinicaltrials.org/>,  
57 TCTR20210823004.

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

## 69 Introduction

70 Since 2019, the human coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has spread throughout the world, including  
71 Thailand [[1](#), [2](#)]. This emerging disease directly affects the patient's respiratory system [[3](#)]. Its clinical signs and  
72 symptoms range from fever, cough, chill, short, shallow, and difficult breathing, fatigue, malaise, headache,  
73 anosmia, ageusia, sore throat, stuffy nose and runny nose, nausea and vomiting, and diarrhea [[3-5](#)]. Patients with  
74 more severe conditions experience more pronounced signs and symptoms, which are caused by pneumonia [[6](#)].  
75 Physiotherapy programs (PTPs) are commonly suggested for adults with pneumonia who are intubated and  
76 mechanically ventilated, promoting clearance of secretions and lung compliance [[7](#)]. An expert physiotherapist  
77 suggested that PTPs should be applied to COVID-19 patients if there is an indication of pneumonia without  
78 exudate consolidation, mucous hypersecretion and difficulty clearing secretions, functional decline, and (at risk  
79 of) intensive care unit (ICU)-acquired weakness [[8-10](#)]. PTPs range from prone positioning, postural drainage,  
80 breathing exercises and devices (e.g. positive expiratory pressure and inspiratory muscle training), ventilator  
81 settings, positioning, as well as functional training, exercise, and early mobilization [[9](#), [11-13](#)].

82 Notably, suggestions of most experts and some of the studies agreed that patients with severe symptoms or  
83 after recovery from the intensive care unit derive benefits from PTPs [[9](#), [11-14](#)]. Conversely, some researchers  
84 have suggested that PTPs be contraindicated during the acute phase because the acute effects of the exercise  
85 program may cause an increase in pro-inflammatory cytokines and viral replication [[15](#), [16](#)]. Nevertheless, a  
86 recent study has shown an improvement in immune function after two weeks of moderate aerobic exercise,[\[17\]](#)  
87 which is supported by previous review studies [[18](#), [19](#)]. Interestingly, most previous studies have investigated the  
88 effects of PTPs in the acute phase or sub-acute phase in severe to critically ill patients with COVID-19 [[11](#), [12](#),  
89 [14](#), [20](#), [21](#)]. However, there are limited studies on the lesser severity of COVID-19 patients. Some of the  
90 recommendations agreed that conventional PTPs and mild to moderate physical exercise can be applied to  
91 COVID-19 patients with mild to moderate severity [[13](#)].

92 To our knowledge, bedside PTPs should be applied to patients as soon as and as often as possible. Some studies  
93 have discovered that more frequent bedside PTPs are more effective at lowering mortality rates, hospitalization  
94 days, and respiratory infections in ICU patients [[22](#)]. However, little is known about the effects of different bedside  
95 PTP frequencies in COVID-19 patients. Thus, this study aimed to compare the different bedside PTP frequencies  
96 on the survival rate, length of hospitalization (LoH), referrals to the ICU, and in-hospital complications. In  
97 addition, the safety of patients during and after performing PTPs was investigated. We hypothesized that COVID-

98 19 patients receiving daily bedside PTPs would have a significantly higher survival rate, lower LoH, as well as  
99 fewer complications compared to those receiving fewer bedside PTPs. In addition, none of the COVID-19 patients  
100 had serious adverse events during and after PTPs, and no physiotherapists tested positive for COVID-19 infection.

## 101 **Methods**

### 102 **Study design**

103 A prospective, quasi-experimental study design was used to determine the effects of PTPs in the acute phase of  
104 patients with COVID-19. This study was conducted at Bamrasnaradura Infectious Diseases Institute, Nonthaburi  
105 Province, Thailand, from November 2021 to January 2022. The technical approval was granted by the Human  
106 Research Ethics Committee of the Bamrasnaradura Infectious Disease Institute, Nonthaburi Province (S020h/64),  
107 and the Human Research Ethics Committee of Walailak University, Nakhon Si Thammarat Province (WU-EC-  
108 AL-3-186-64). Written informed consent was acquired from all participants. All procedures performed in this  
109 study involving humans were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research  
110 committee and the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendment or comparable ethical standards.

### 111 **Study population**

112 Participants were assigned into two groups and stratified by age and gender. General inclusion criteria included  
113 adults aged 18-65 years old with 1) a nucleic acid test-confirmed diagnosis of SAR CoV-2 infection, 2)  
114 hospitalization due to any clinical signs and symptoms of pneumonia, 3) no communication problems, and 4)  
115 ability to use an online mobile phone application. For specific inclusion criteria, patients were recruited if one of  
116 the following criteria was indicated: [8, 9] 1) COVID-19 with risk factors for severe disease, 2) confirmed case  
117 of pneumonia with hypoxia (resting blood oxygen saturation ( $SpO_2$ )  $< 96\%$  or the presence of exercise-induced  
118 hypoxemia defined as a reduction in  $SpO_2 > 3\%$  compared to baseline, 3) inability to expel secretions caused by  
119 prolonged immobilization and respiratory muscle weakness, 4) presence of breathlessness or dyspnea needing  
120 oxygen therapy (presence of signs of pneumonia with lung consolidation by chest radiograph or computerized  
121 tomography or lung ultrasound), and 5) presence of functional limitation caused by prolonged hospitalization or  
122 prolonged ICU stay or prolonged use of a respirator or oxygen device. Exclusion criteria included 1) unwillingness  
123 or inability to follow the study protocol and 2) active participation in another study.

124

## 125 **Characteristics and classification of disease severity of COVID-19**

126 COVID-19 patients were categorized as mild, moderate, severe, and critical according to the World Health  
127 Organization definition [23]. Mild severity (mild pneumonia) was defined as a person with the following  
128 symptoms: fever, cough, fatigue, anorexia, shortness of breath, and myalgia. Moderate severity (moderate  
129 pneumonia) was defined as a person with more pronounced signs and symptoms of viral pneumonia or hypoxia.  
130 Severe COVID-19 was defined as a person with pneumonia accompanied by any signs and symptoms, including  
131 respiratory rate > 30 times/min, and SpO<sub>2</sub> < 90% on room air. Critical disease was defined as a patient with ARDS  
132 [23]. In addition, a laboratory investigation including the open reading frame gene 1ab (ORF1ab) and the envelope  
133 (E) gene of SARS-CoV-2, complete blood count (CBC), kidney and liver function, tissue damage markers (lactate  
134 dehydrogenase (LDH)), inflammatory markers (i.e. erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) and C-reactive protein  
135 (CRP)), chest radiography, and medications were used to classify the severity of patients at baseline. A patient  
136 who has been administered a combination of antiviral drugs and/or received corticosteroid treatment was classified  
137 as a moderate to severe case.

## 138 **Intervention (physiotherapy programs (PTPs))**

139 Participants in Experimental Group One (Ex-G1) received only a one-time bedside PTPs for the first few days  
140 after hospital admission. However, some patients remained confused of the program, and thus a second bedside  
141 PTPs was taught to patients. Meanwhile, participants in Experimental Group Two (Ex-G2) had daily bedside  
142 PTPs until hospital discharge. PTPs comprised of breathing exercises, secretion removal techniques (coughing,  
143 huffing, and positioning), active chest trunk mobilization, active exercise of both limbs, and early progressive  
144 mobilizations/ ambulation [9, 11-13]. The BreatheMax®V.2 device (C&D Biomedical, Thailand) that operates  
145 based on a principle of positive expiratory pressure (PEP) and oscillating incentive spirometer (OIS) was given  
146 to Ex-G2 patients. In addition, all patients were asked to join a closed private group via a mobile application  
147 platform. Some of the patients were encouraged and monitored their signs and symptoms directly on their private  
148 mobile application or ward phone, especially Ex-G1 participants who were taught only one-time PTPs.

149

150

## 151 **Safety considerations for COVID-19 patients in assigning the** 152 **physiotherapy programs**

153 Prior to perform bedside PTPs, all patient data, vital signs, and medical records were intensively reviewed by the  
154 physiotherapists. Patients were questioned on their current signs and symptoms. Permission was not granted for  
155 physiotherapist treatment if the patient had any of the following regardless of whether they were on a ventilator:  
156 fraction of inspired oxygen ( $FiO_2$ ) > 0.6,  $SpO_2$  < 90%, respiratory rate (RR) > 40 times/min, positive end-  
157 expiratory pressure (PEEP) > 10 cmH<sub>2</sub>O, ventilator resistance, unstable cardiovascular signs (systolic blood  
158 pressure > 180 mmHg or diastolic blood pressure > 110 mmHg, heart rate < 40 or > 120 beats/min) [24]. If  $SpO_2$   
159 decreased > 3% from baseline during the PTPs session, they were not allowed to continue the session.

## 160 **Safety for physiotherapists to prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission**

161 Physiotherapists were trained to use personal protective equipment (PPE) properly before performing bedside  
162 PTPs [9]. Importantly, all physiotherapists had to strictly follow aerosol, airborne, and contact precautions [9].  
163 For physiotherapist safety considerations, all of them must have 1) a minimum of two doses of the COVID-19  
164 vaccine before initiation of the study for at least 2 weeks, 2) good health with no comorbidities, 3) age of < 45  
165 years [9], and 4) at least two years of experience in chest physiotherapy. All physiotherapists were tested weekly  
166 for COVID-19 infection using reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), and rapid antigen test  
167 kit (ATK).

## 168 **Outcome measures**

169 The primary outcomes were survival rate, length of hospital stay (LoH), number of patients who were referred to  
170 ICU, and rates/types of complications. The secondary outcome was the safety of the patients, which was indicated  
171 by the minor and serious adverse events during and after each physical therapy session. A minor adverse event  
172 was defined as an event that slightly affected the patient, requiring time for rest, and recovery within 15 minutes  
173 for example; dizziness, nausea and vomiting, postural hypotension (blood pressure drop > 10 mmHg from  
174 baseline), fatigue, and  $SpO_2$  drop greater than 3% from baseline. A serious adverse event was defined as an event  
175 that needed urgent assistance, for example, medications or resuscitation. In addition, the other secondary outcome  
176 was the safety of the physiotherapists. The physiotherapists were tested for COVID-19 infection using RT-PCR  
177 and ATK every week.

## 178 **Laboratory tests**

179 Blood samples were collected from all participants in the antebachial area. RT-PCR was performed using a  
180 Cobas® 6800 SARS-CoV-2 assay on the Cobas ® 6800 platforms (Roche Diagnostics, Basel, Switzerland) to  
181 identify the presence of the ORF1ab and the E-gene of SARS-CoV-2. ATK was tested using a Singclean  
182 (Hangzhou Singclean Medical Products, China). CBC was examined using an electrical impedance (Mindray  
183 Model CAL 6000, China). Meanwhile, the renal function test, liver function test, and LDH were examined using  
184 photometry (Beckman Coulter, USA). ESR was examined using the Westergren method (Mini-VES, Italy). CRP  
185 was examined using immunofluorescence (UNICELL-S, China).

## 186 **Statistical analysis**

187 Descriptive data was reported as mean±SD or median (IQR) if it indicated normal or non-normal distribution of  
188 data, respectively. The sample size was calculated using the G-Power program Version 3.10. The partial eta square  
189 ( $\eta^2$ ) was set at a medium level. Assuming a moderate effect size of 0.25, a power of 90%, and a dropout rate of  
190 20%, thus we planned for enrolling 52 participants. The parametric distribution was assessed using the Shapiro-  
191 Wilk test. Nominal data were summarized as frequencies and percentages. Categorical variables were compared  
192 using the Chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate. Continuous variables were compared by  
193 Independent t-test or Mann-Whitney U test, as appropriate. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for  
194 Social Sciences Version 22.0 (IBM Inc., Armonk, NY). The level of significance was taken at 0.05 or 5%.

195

## 196 **Results**

### 197 **Participant characteristics**

198 Sixty-six COVID-19 patients were identified as eligible for participation. Fourteen participants were excluded as  
199 shown in [Fig 1](#). Most participants were classified as having the Delta variant (one participant had the Omicron  
200 variant). The mean age of all participants was 45±14 years, and 46% were men. Most participants (87%) were  
201 vaccinated against COVID-19. The COVID-19 severity was similar between groups ([Table 1](#) and [Table 2](#)). Most  
202 participants (n = 49, 94%) were categorized as non-severe cases, which ranged from mild to moderate conditions  
203 of COVID-19. The proportions of disease severity were mild (n = 26; 50%), moderate (n = 23; 44%), and severe  
204 (n = 3; 6%) conditions. Most participants had comorbidities (n = 41, 79%). At the first bedside physiotherapy



205 visit, three Ex-G1 and twelve Ex-G2 patients were admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU). None of the baseline  
206 characteristics were significantly different between groups (all  $p > 0.05$ ) (Table 1 and Table 2). Most hematologic  
207 parameters were in the normal range, except for the inflammatory markers of ESR and CRP (Table 2).

208

209 **Fig 1.** Flow diagram for participants throughout this study

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

**Table 1.** Comparison of baseline characteristics between groups.

	<b>Ex-G1 (n = 26)</b>	<b>Ex-G2 (n = 26)</b>	<b>P Value</b>
Men	12 (46%)	12 (46%)	1.000
Age, mean (SD), years	43.50 (13.34)	45.92 (15.24)	0.545
Age > 60 y	4 (16%)	5 (19%)	0.714
Education level			
Higher than bachelor degree	4 (16%)	1 (4%)	0.168
Bachelor degree	9 (35%)	7 (27%)	
Secondary school	4 (16%)	10 (38%)	
Primary school	7 (27%)	8 (31%)	
No formal education	2 (8%)	0	
On oxygen devices			
Nasal cannula	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	0.350
High flow nasal cannula	0	1 (4%)	
Mechanical ventilator	0	0	
Comorbidities			
No	4 (15%)	7 (27%)	0.308
Yes <sup>a</sup>	22 (85%)	19 (73%)	
BW, median (IQR), kg	69.50 (57.00, 89.25)	68.00 (57.00, 85.00)	0.905
BMI, median (IQR), kg/m <sup>2</sup>	25.06 (22.83, 32.34)	26.88 (23.18, 30.99)	0.504
Classification of BMI <sup>b</sup>			
Obese	13 (50%)	16 (62%)	0.606
Overweight	6 (23%)	5 (19%)	
Normal	7 (27%)	5 (19%)	
COVID-19 disease severity			
Mild	15 (58%)	11 (42%)	0.538
Moderate	10 (38%)	13 (50%)	
Severe	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	
Duration from admission to initiating PT, mean (SD), days	1.62 (0.80)	1.69 (1.09)	0.773
Antiviral medication use			
Favipiravir	24 (92%)	22 (100%)	1.000
Mixed antiviral drug	13 (50%)	10 (40%)	0.402
Corticosteroid drug	3 (12%)	8 (32%)	0.090

Data expressed as n (%) unless otherwise stated.

<sup>a</sup> Comorbidities included hypertension, diabetes mellitus, cerebrovascular accident, thyroid, allergy, glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency, chronic hepatitis B infection, thalassemia, systemic lupus erythematosus, enlarged prostate, gout, old tuberculosis infection, migraine, and chronic kidney disease.

---

<sup>b</sup> Obese = BMI  $\geq$  25; overweight =  $23 \leq$  BMI < 25; and normal =  $18.5 \leq$  BMI < 23.

Abbreviation: BMI, body mass index; BW, body weight; COVID-19, Coronavirus Disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit; IQR, interquartile range; PT, physiotherapy; SD, standard deviation

---

227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253

**Table 2.** Comparison of baseline blood biomarkers between groups.

	Ex-G1 (n = 26)	Ex-G2 (n = 25 <sup>a</sup> )	P Value
ORF1ab gene, Ct	20.81 (17.76, 23.64)	20.56 (18.59, 24.10)	0.859
E-gene, Ct	21.70 (18.09, 24.09)	21.07 (19.03, 23.93)	0.861
Complete blood count			
WBC, mean (SD), ×10 <sup>3</sup> /uL	6.90 (1.74)	7.01 (2.44)	0.856
RBC, mean (SD), 10 <sup>6</sup> /uL	5.07 (0.61)	4.83 (0.64)	0.167
HGB, mean (SD), g/dL	13.27 (1.56)	13.4 (1.45)	0.661
HCT, mean (SD), %	40.62 (4.44)	40.84 (4.01)	0.850
RDW, %	13.90 (13.00, 14.53)	13.50 (12.60, 13.90)	0.086
Platelet, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /uL	254.00 (215.50, 293.75)	254.00 (207.50, 332.00)	0.706
Neutrophil, mean (SD), %	60.77 (13.39)	63.56 (12.94)	0.453
Lymphocyte, mean (SD), %	28.46 (12.34)	26.84 (12.83)	0.647
Monocyte, %	7.50 (6.00, 10.00)	6.00 (5.00, 9.50)	0.209
Eosinophil, %	1.00 (0.00, 3.00)	1.00 (0.00, 2.00)	0.486
Basophil, %	0.00 (0.00, 1.00)	0.00 (0.00, 1.00)	0.925
Kidney function test			
BUN, mg/dL	12.50 (9.00, 15.00)	11.00 (8.00, 17.00)	0.769
Creatinine, mg/dL	0.74 (0.64, 0.88)	0.71 (0.58, 1.04)	0.850
eGFR, mL/min/1.73m <sup>2</sup>	106.01 (87.45, 115.83)	107.06 (71.72, 122.14)	0.880
eGFR stage, n (%)			0.086
Stage I	19 (73%)	17 (68%)	
Stage II	7 (27%)	4 (16%)	
Stage III	0	4 (16%)	
Liver function test			
Total protein, mean (SD), g/dl	7.74 (0.75)	7.63 (0.58)	0.655
Total bilirubin, mean (SD), mg/dl	0.49 (0.18)	0.52 (0.17)	0.855
Alkaline phosphate, U/L	69.00 (55.00, 88.00)	67.00 (52.00, 78.50)	0.516
AST/SGOT, U/L	26.00 (22.50, 36.50)	26.00 (23.00, 30.00)	0.437
ALT/SGPT, U/L	24.00 (17.00, 47.50)	22.00 (14.00, 39.00)	0.166
LDH, U/L	189.30 (159.50, 207.15)	176.30 (163.55, 242.85)	0.777
Inflammation biomarkers			
ESR, mean (SD), mm/hr	26.92 (13.06)	31.12 (19.00)	0.297
CRP, mg/dL	8.26 (3.56, 17.94)	13.89 (5.80, 25.66)	0.122

Data expressed as median (IQR) unless otherwise stated.

<sup>a</sup> n = 25 due to a laboratory test of one participant that the clinician did not order.

---

*Abbreviation:* ALT/ SGPT, alanine aminotransferase/ serum glutamic-pyruvic transaminase; AST/ SGOT, aspartate aminotransferase/ serum glutamic-oxaloacetic transaminase; BUN, blood urine nitrogen; CRP, C-reactive protein; Ct, threshold cycle; E-gene, envelope gene; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESR, erythrocyte sedimentation rate; HCT, hematocrit; HGB, hemoglobin; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; ORF1ab-gene, open reading frames ab gene; RBC, red blood cell; RDW, red blood cell distribution width; WBC, white blood cell

---

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

**Table 3.** Outcome measurement comparison between groups.

	Ex-G1 (n = 26)	Ex-G2 (n = 26)	P Value
Survival	26 (100%)	25 (96%)	1.000
Death	0	1 (4%)	1.000
LoH, median (IQR), days	10.00 (9.00, 11.80)	10.00 (10.00, 12.00)	0.117
Patients referred to ICU	0	1 (4%)	0.313
Complications			
Influenza	0	1 (4%)	0.555
Bacterial infection	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	
Cardiac arrest	0	1 (4%)	
None	24 (92%)	22 (84%)	
Minor adverse event			
Drop of SpO <sub>2</sub> > 3% from baseline	0	8 (31%)	0.018
Dizziness	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	
Nausea & vomiting	2 (8%)	0	
<sup>a</sup> Dyspnea	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	
<sup>a</sup> Dyspnea & drop of SpO <sub>2</sub> > 3% from baseline	0	1 (4%)	
None	21 (80%)	15 (57%)	
Average of PT bedside, median (IQR)	2.00 (1.00, 2.00)	6.00 (5.00, 7.00)	<0.001
Number of patients receiving each PT program			
Breathing exercise, cough/ huff training, active chest trunk mobilization, positioning, active exercise of UE and LE	26 (100%)	26 (100%)	1.000
Positive expiratory pressure devices	0	26 (100%)	<0.001
Out-of-bed exercise	0	26 (100%)	<0.001

Data expressed as n (%) unless otherwise stated.

<sup>a</sup> Dyspnea caused by continued cough during breathing exercise

Abbreviation: ICU; intensive care unit; IQR, interquartile range; LE, lower extremity; LoH, length of hospital stay; PT, physiotherapy; UE, upper extremity

272

273

274

275

276

277

## 278 **Primary outcomes**

279 There were no significant differences in all outcome measures found between the intervention groups ( $p > 0.05$ )  
280 (Table 3). The survival rate of all COVID-19 patients was 98% in this study. The survival rate of COVID-19  
281 patients with mild and moderate conditions was equal (100%) between the groups. There was only one Ex-G2  
282 participant referred to the ICU room after enrollment to the study because of influenza. There were two Ex-G1  
283 and four Ex-G2 participants with complications after receiving PTPs (Table 3).

## 284 **Secondary outcomes**

285 Five Ex-G1 and eleven Ex-G2 COVID-19 patients had minor adverse events during and after the PTPs (Table 3).  
286 Among eight Ex-G2 participants, there were 14 sessions (9%) of the bedside PTPs that had a SpO<sub>2</sub> drop  $> 3\%$   
287 from baseline (Table 3). None of the participants had serious adverse events during and immediately after the  
288 PTPs. There was one Ex-G2 participant who died of cardiac arrest on the following day after the first bedside  
289 PTPs. There were no physiotherapists who tested positive for COVID-19 as a consequence of instructing bedside  
290 PTPs to patients. The number of physiotherapy sessions was significantly different between the groups ( $p <$   
291  $0.001$ ).

## 293 **Discussion**

294 To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the different frequencies of bedside PTPs in COVID-19  
295 patients during admission to the hospital. In addition, there was a lack of study reports on the safety of bedside  
296 PTPs in the acute phase of COVID-19 patients who were mostly identified with a mild to moderate degree of  
297 severity. The main findings found no differences between groups in regard to survival rate, LoH, referrals to the  
298 ICU, and in-hospital complications. Overall, there was a high survival rate of patients, no deaths among mild to  
299 moderate COVID-19 patients, a limited number of COVID-19 patients who were referred to ICU after receiving  
300 the PTPs, and a low rate of complications observed after receiving the PTPs. Importantly, none of the serious  
301 adverse events occurred during and immediately after each PTP session. In addition, no physiotherapists tested  
302 positive for COVID-19 during two months of the in-hospital data collection period.

303 To date, there are few reports on the effects of PTPs documented in the acute phase of COVID-19 [[11](#), [12](#),  
304 [14](#)]. In literature, most previous studies have investigated physical rehabilitation in severe cases of COVID-19 or

305 in patients who were referred to ICU[[11](#), [14](#)] or after recovery from critical illnesses [[20](#), [21](#)]. Also, a study  
306 assessed patients who were negative for SAR-CoV-2 by laboratory diagnostic tests [[21](#)] or long-lasting hospital  
307 stay, which was safer and less likely to be infected with COVID-19 compared to our study conducted with active  
308 COVID-19. Interestingly, previous studies have reported that PTPs were safe and feasible in the ICU setting or  
309 the post-recovery period [[14](#), [20](#), [21](#)]. PTPs also improved the patient's motor and respiratory function, along with  
310 functional activity, particularly in post-critical illness patients [[14](#), [20](#), [21](#)]. However, those patients were older  
311 and had more severe conditions than patients in the present study [[11](#), [12](#), [14](#)].

312 The effects of PTPs in the current study may provide positive effects on physical function similar to a previous  
313 study that had examined a one-week telerehabilitation in mild to moderate COVID-19 patients who were confined  
314 at home [[25](#)]. To support this, there was only one patient who was referred to the ICU, few complications found,  
315 and none of the patients with mild to moderate conditions died in the present study. In addition, our study showed  
316 minor complications (9.6%, 4 bacterial infections, 1 influenza) compared to an earlier study that had found  
317 approximately 39% of complications in patients aged between 19 and 49 years [[26](#)]. Also, there were no patients  
318 who developed ARDS in this study, which is contrary to a previous study that had reported 23% and 4% of ARDS  
319 in the pneumonia group and mild to moderate group, respectively [[27](#)]. For these reasons, the survival rate of  
320 patients with mild to moderate conditions in the current study was very high, contrary to many previous studies  
321 [[12](#), [14](#)]. Meanwhile, the LoH of a previous study [[20](#)] is comparable to the present study, which was 9.8 days.  
322 Similarly, the median LoH of patients with pneumonia not caused by COVID-19 was 9 days [[28](#)]. In contrast, a  
323 recent review study had found that the median LoH of COVID-19 patients in China and other countries was 14  
324 and 5 days, respectively. However, the LoH during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic showed higher LoH  
325 compared to the current study [[29](#)]. The variations in LoH could be due to differences in health policies for each  
326 country, the development of treatment, and the effectiveness of vaccination. In Thailand, the Ministry of Public  
327 Health has announced that COVID-19 patients must stay in the hospital for at least 10 days as a control against  
328 SAR-CoV-2 transmission.

329 The two most used PTPs including breathing exercises and progressive mobilization/ exercise confirmed that  
330 they were safe for COVID-19 patients. None of the patients experienced serious adverse events during and  
331 immediately after the PTPs. This might be caused by the comprehensive screening of patients' clinical records  
332 before and after the PTPs [[20](#)]. Among the minor adverse events, a drop of SpO<sub>2</sub> >3% from baseline was the most  
333 common adverse effect found in the Ex-G2 group because participants in the Ex-G2 group were encouraged at



334 the bedside to perform light exercise/ ambulation. Our findings support a recent systemic review that had found  
335 that pulmonary rehabilitation was safe and feasible for COVID-19 patients [30]. In addition, it is in line with a  
336 previous recommendation that patients with mild conditions may benefit from breathing exercises [31]. A  
337 previous study has also shown symptomatic improvement after six weeks of an online breathing program for  
338 patients with post-COVID-19 condition [32]. In addition, patients with mild symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 were  
339 able to perform mild-to-moderate intensity exercise during active COVID-19 [33]. However, the exercise intensity  
340 which is higher than the lactate threshold might not be appropriate according to the production of the respiratory  
341 droplet [34]. Also, previous studies have demonstrated that exercise at moderate intensity could downregulate  
342 inflammatory cytokines and stimulate the release of anti-inflammatory substances [18, 19]. Likewise, two weeks  
343 of moderate aerobic exercise for COVID-19 patients recently have shown an improvement in immune function  
344 [17]. A recent study supported that exercise promotes myokines production which would alleviate SARS-CoV-2  
345 infectivity [35]. Besides the physical aspect, the psychological impact may also improve after bedside PTPs which  
346 is supported by a previous study [36]. The PTPs in this study are similar to our study, except for craft activities,  
347 which were added in the previous study [36]. Thus, a positive immune system response, the release of anti-SAR  
348 CoV-2 substances, and mental improvement after the PTPs might promote the beneficial effects on most of the  
349 primary outcome measures. Notably, we provided the BreatheMax, a breathing biofeedback device, to Ex-G2  
350 patients. From our observation, it can increase SpO<sub>2</sub> within a few minutes, similar to a conventional breathing  
351 exercise. Thus, this study supports a previous recommendation that PEP or OIS devices can be applied to COVID-  
352 19 patients without complications [9]. Interestingly, one to two times of bedside PTPs provided equal benefits  
353 compared to the daily PTP group. This may be caused by the patients of both groups being encouraged to perform  
354 PTPs via a ward phone, private mobile phone application, and closed private groups. Thus, daily bedside PTPs  
355 may be unnecessary to implement for COVID-19 patients with mild to moderate conditions. Telemedicine is an  
356 alternative platform in the case of restrictions for bedside PTPs. Importantly, our study confirmed that bedside  
357 PTPs were safe for physiotherapists because there were no reports of COVID-19 infection during the two months  
358 of prospective data collection among these physiotherapists. Indeed, the physiotherapists in our study strictly  
359 followed the airborne, aerosol, and manual contact precautions when providing bedside PTPs to reduce the  
360 possibility of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

361 There were some limitations in the present study. First, this study did not have a control group, and thus there  
362 were no data to compare with conventional treatment. Second, the objective outcome measures and psychological  
363 status at baseline could not be performed due to unstable signs and symptoms and concerns about COVID-19

364 transmission, which were similar to most previous case reports that were unable to perform those tests [11, 12].  
365 In addition, blood biomarkers and chest radiographs were not allowed to be tested before discharge according to  
366 the limitation of hospital rules. These variables may have been useful to explain the physiological changes after  
367 the PTPs. Third, according to the quarantine rule, patients could not be discharged from the hospital even if there  
368 were no complications and they had almost fully recovered from COVID-19 infection. Consequently, the LoH  
369 among the groups found no differences. Future studies are highly recommended to confirm the findings of the  
370 present study with a conventional treatment control group and regardless of a mandatory quarantine rule.

## 371 **Conclusion**

372 The different bedside PTP frequency in COVID-19 patients with primarily mild to moderate conditions found no  
373 differences in the survival rate, LoH, referrals to the ICU, and in-hospital complications. PTPs are safe for  
374 COVID-19 patients and physiotherapists. A prudent assessment and monitoring of physiological parameters  
375 during the PTPs are necessary to prevent unpredictable adverse events.

## 376 **Supporting information**

377 S1 raw data

378 (XLSX)

379 S2 Trend checklist

380 (PDF)

## 381 **Acknowledgments**

382 We would like to thank all the researchers who participated in this study, in particular, the physiotherapists  
383 involved in the data collection processes. They were willing to join the study even though they might have a  
384 chance to contract COVID-19. The authors are thankful to the Bamrasnaradura Infectious Disease Institute, which  
385 allowed us to collect data. Importantly, we are indebted to all COVID-19 patients, who devoted time to participate  
386 in this study.

## 387 **Author Contributions**

388 **Conceptualization:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Netchanok Jianramas, Veeranoote Nissapatorn, Chaisith Sivakorn,  
389 Maria de Lourdes Pereira, Chenpak Salesingh, Eittipad Jaiyen.

390 **Data curation:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Netchanok Jianramas, Anuttra (Chaovavanich) Ratnarathon, Chenpak  
391 Salesingh, Eittipad Jaiyen, Salinee Chaiyakul, Nitita Piya-amornphan, Thanaporn Semphuet, Thanrada  
392 Thiangtham, Kornchanok Boontam.

393 **Formal analysis:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Netchanok Jianramas.

394 **Funding acquisition:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Maria de Lourdes Pereira.

395 **Investigation:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Netchanok Jianramas, Anuttra (Chaovavanich) Ratnarathon, Chenpak  
396 Salesingh, Eittipad Jaiyen, Salinee Chaiyakul, Nitita Piya-amornphan, Thanaporn Semphuet, Thanrada  
397 Thiangtham, Kornchanok Boontam.

398 **Methodology:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Netchanok Jianramas, Veeranut Nissapatorn, Chaisith Sivakorn, Maria  
399 de Lourdes Pereira, Anuttra (Chaovavanich) Ratnarathon, Chenpak Salesingh, Eittipad Jaiyen, Salinee Chaiyakul,  
400 Nitita Piya-amornphan, Thanaporn Semphuet, Thanrada Thiangtham.

401 **Project administration:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Netchanok Jianramas.

402 **Writing – original draft:** Khomkrip Longlalerng.

403 **Writing – review & editing:** Khomkrip Longlalerng, Netchanok Jianramas, Veeranut Nissapatorn, Chaisith  
404 Sivakorn, Maria de Lourdes Pereira, Anuttra (Chaovavanich) Ratnarathon, Chenpak Salesingh, Eittipad Jaiyen,  
405 Salinee Chaiyakul, Nitita Piya-amornphan, Thanaporn Semphuet, Thanrada Thiangtham, Kornchanok Boontam.

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

## 413 **References**

- 414 1. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. 2022 [Available from:  
415 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>.
- 416 2. Department of disease control of Thailand. Covid-19 infected situation updated daily. 2022 [Available  
417 from: <https://ddc.moph.go.th/viralpneumonia/index.php>.
- 418 3. da Rosa Mesquita R, Francelino Silva Junior LC, Santos Santana FM, Farias de Oliveira T, Campos  
419 Alcântara R, Monteiro Arnozo G, et al. Clinical manifestations of COVID-19 in the general population:  
420 systematic review. *Wien Klin Wochenschr.* 2021;133(7-8):377-82.
- 421 4. Ochani R, Asad A, Yasmin F, Shaikh S, Khalid H, Batra S, et al. COVID-19 pandemic: from origins to  
422 outcomes. A comprehensive review of viral pathogenesis, clinical manifestations, diagnostic evaluation,  
423 and management. *Infez Med.* 2021;29(1):20-36.
- 424 5. Grant MC, Geoghegan L, Arbyn M, Mohammed Z, McGuinness L, Clarke EL, et al. The prevalence of  
425 symptoms in 24,410 adults infected by the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19): A systematic  
426 review and meta-analysis of 148 studies from 9 countries. *PLOS ONE.* 2020;15(6):e0234765.
- 427 6. He X, Cheng X, Feng X, Wan H, Chen S, Xiong M. Clinical symptom differences between mild and  
428 severe COVID-19 patients in China: A meta-analysis. *Front Public Health.* 2021;8(954).
- 429 7. van der Lee L, Hill AM, Jacques A, Patman S. Efficacy of respiratory physiotherapy interventions for  
430 intubated and mechanically ventilated adults with pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
431 *Physiother Can.* 2021;73(1):6-18.
- 432 8. Felten-Barentsz KM, van Oorsouw R, Klooster E, Koenders N, Driehuis F, Hulzebos EHJ, et al.  
433 Recommendations for hospital-based physical therapists managing patients with COVID-19. *Phys Ther.*  
434 2020;100(9):1444-57.
- 435 9. Thomas P, Baldwin C, Beach L, Bissett B, Boden I, Cruz SM, et al. Physiotherapy management for  
436 COVID-19 in the acute hospital setting and beyond: an update to clinical practice recommendations. *J*  
437 *Physiother.* 2022;68(1):8-25.
- 438 10. Vitacca M, Carone M, Clini EM, Paneroni M, Lazzeri M, Lanza A, et al. Joint statement on the role of  
439 respiratory rehabilitation in the COVID-19 crisis: the Italian position paper. *Respiration.* 2020;99(6):493-  
440 9.

- 441 11. Eggmann S, Kindler A, Perren A, Ott N, Johannes F, Vollenweider R, et al. Early physical therapist  
442 interventions for patients with COVID-19 in the acute care hospital: A case report series. *Phys Ther.*  
443 2021;101(1).
- 444 12. Gaspari CH, Assumpção I, Freire R, Silva A, Santiso C, Jaccoud AC. The first 60 days: physical therapy  
445 in a neurosurgical center converted into a COVID-19 center in Brazil. *Phys Ther.* 2020;100(12):2120-6.
- 446 13. Wittmer VL, Paro FM, Duarte H, Capellini VK, Barbalho-Moulim MC. Early mobilization and physical  
447 exercise in patients with COVID-19: A narrative literature review. *Complement Ther Clin Pract.*  
448 2021;43:101364.
- 449 14. Li L, Yu P, Yang M, Xie W, Huang L, He C, et al. Physical therapist management of COVID-19 in the  
450 intensive care unit: the west China hospital experience. *Phys Ther.* 2021;101(1).
- 451 15. Kiel RJ, Smith FE, Chason J, Khatib R, Reyes MP. Coxsackievirus B3 myocarditis in C3H/HeJ mice:  
452 description of an inbred model and the effect of exercise on virulence. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 1989;5(3):348-  
453 50.
- 454 16. Lazzeri M, Lanza A, Bellini R, Bellofiore A, Cecchetto S, Colombo A, et al. Respiratory physiotherapy  
455 in patients with COVID-19 infection in acute setting: a position paper of the Italian Association of  
456 Respiratory Physiotherapists (ARIR). *Monaldi Arch Chest Dis.* 2020;90(1).
- 457 17. Mohamed AA, Alawna M. The effect of aerobic exercise on immune biomarkers and symptoms severity  
458 and progression in patients with COVID-19: A randomized control trial. *J Bodyw Mov Ther.*  
459 2021;28:425-32.
- 460 18. Martin SA, Pence BD, Woods JA. Exercise and respiratory tract viral infections. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.*  
461 2009;37(4):157-64.
- 462 19. Leandro CG, Ferreira E Silva WT, Lima-Silva AE. Covid-19 and exercise-induced immunomodulation.  
463 *Neuroimmunomodulation.* 2020;27(1):75-8.
- 464 20. Piquet V, Luczak C, Seiler F, Monaury J, Martini A, Ward AB, et al. Do patients with COVID-19 benefit  
465 from rehabilitation? functional outcomes of the first 100 patients in a COVID-19 rehabilitation unit. *Arch*  
466 *Phys Med Rehabil.* 2021;102(6):1067-74.
- 467 21. Zampogna E, Paneroni M, Belli S, Aliani M, Gandolfo A, Visca D, et al. Pulmonary rehabilitation in  
468 patients recovering from COVID-19. *Respiration.* 2021;100(5):416-22.

- 469 22. Castro AAM, Calil SR, Freitas SA, Oliveira AB, Porto EF. Chest physiotherapy effectiveness to reduce  
470 hospitalization and mechanical ventilation length of stay, pulmonary infection rate and mortality in ICU  
471 patients. *Respir Med*. 2013;107(1):68-74.
- 472 23. World Health Organization. Living guidance for clinical management of COVID-19: Living guidance,  
473 23 November 2021. 2021. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-clinical-2021-2)  
474 [clinical-2021-2](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-clinical-2021-2).
- 475 24. Abdullahi A. Safety and efficacy of chest physiotherapy in patients with COVID-19: a critical review.  
476 *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2020;7(454).
- 477 25. Gonzalez-Gerez JJ, Saavedra-Hernandez M, Anarte-Lazo E, Bernal-Utrera C, Perez-Ale M, Rodriguez-  
478 Blanco C. Short-Term effects of a respiratory telerehabilitation program in confined COVID-19 patients  
479 in the acute phase: A pilot study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(14).
- 480 26. Drake TM, Riad AM, Fairfield CJ, Egan C, Knight SR, Pius R, et al. Characterisation of in-hospital  
481 complications associated with COVID-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol  
482 UK: a prospective, multicentre cohort study. *The Lancet*. 2021;398(10296):223-37.
- 483 27. Minh LHN, Abozaid AA-F, Ha NX, Le Quang L, Gad AG, Tiwari R, et al. Clinical and laboratory factors  
484 associated with coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19): A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Rev Med*  
485 *Virolog*. 2021;31(6):e2288.
- 486 28. Menéndez R, Cremades MJ, Martínez-Moragón E, Soler JJ, Reyes S, Perpiñá M. Duration of length of  
487 stay in pneumonia: influence of clinical factors and hospital type. *Eur Respir J*. 2003;22(4):643.
- 488 29. Hartsgrove C, Guevarra-Fernandez J, Kendall J, Delauter G, Kirshblum S. Measuring Discharge  
489 Outcomes, Length of Stay, and Functional ADL Score During COVID-19 in Inpatient Rehabilitation  
490 Hospitals. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2021;102(12):2291-9.
- 491 30. Ahmed I, Mustafaoglu R, Yeldan I, Yasaci Z, Erhan B. Effect of pulmonary rehabilitation approaches  
492 on dyspnea, exercise capacity, fatigue, lung functions and quality of life in patients with COVID-19: A  
493 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2022;103(10):2051-62.
- 494 31. Righetti RF, Onoue MA, Politi FVA, Teixeira DT, Souza PN, Kondo CS, et al. Physiotherapy care of  
495 patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) - A Brazilian experience. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*.  
496 2020;75:e2017.

- 497 32. Philip KEJ, Owles H, McVey S, Pagnuco T, Bruce K, Brunjes H, et al. An online breathing and wellbeing  
498 programme (ENO Breathe) for people with persistent symptoms following COVID-19: a parallel-group,  
499 single-blind, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2022;10(9):851-63.
- 500 33. Zhu Y, Wang Z, Zhou Y, Onoda K, Maruyama H, Hu C, et al. Summary of respiratory rehabilitation and  
501 physical therapy guidelines for patients with COVID-19 based on recommendations of World  
502 Confederation for Physical Therapy and National Association of Physical Therapy. *J Phys Ther Sci*.  
503 2020;32(8):545-9.
- 504 34. Katsumata Y, Sano M, Okawara H, Sawada T, Nakashima D, Ichihara G, et al. Laminar flow ventilation  
505 system to prevent airborne infection during exercise in the COVID-19 crisis: A single-center  
506 observational study. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(11):e0257549.
- 507 35. Bhardwaj V, Dela Cruz M, Subramanyam D, Kumar R, Markan S, Parker B, et al. Exercise-induced  
508 myokines downregulates the ACE2 level in bronchial epithelial cells: Implications for SARS-CoV-2  
509 prevention. *PLOS ONE*. 2022;17(7):e0271303.
- 510 36. Jung JH, Won JJ, Ko JY. Psychological rehabilitation for isolated patients with COVID-19 infection: A  
511 randomized controlled study. *PLOS ONE*. 2022;17(12):e0278475.

512

513