

1 ORIGINAL RESEARCH

2 **Understanding quantity and intensity of hospital rehabilitation**
3 **using electronic health record data**

4 Konstantin Georgiev¹, Dimitrios Doudehis¹, Joanne McPeake²,
5 Nicholas L Mills¹, Jacques Fleuriot³, Susan D Shenkin⁴, Atul Anand¹

6
7 ¹ BHF/University Centre for Cardiovascular Science, University of Edinburgh, UK

8 ² The Healthcare Improvement Studies Institute, University of Cambridge, UK

9 ³ Artificial Intelligence and its Applications Institute, University of Edinburgh, UK

10 ⁴ Ageing and Health, and Advanced Care Research Centre, Usher Institute, University of
11 Edinburgh, UK

12
13 **Short Title:** Understanding hospital rehabilitation using electronic health records

14
15 **Corresponding author:**

16 Dr Atul Anand

17 University of Edinburgh/BHF Centre for Cardiovascular Science

18 Room SU.226 Chancellor's Building

19 49 Little France Crescent

20 Edinburgh EH16 4SA

21 United Kingdom

22 Telephone: +44 131 242 6515

23 Fax: +44 131 242 6379

24 Email: atul.anand@ed.ac.uk

25
26
27 **Abstract:** 300

28 **Text:** 3,392

29 **References:** 28

30 **Tables:** 3

31 **Figures:** 3

32 **Appendix:** Supplementary methods, 4 tables and 4 figures

33
34 **Key words:** hospital; rehabilitation; electronic health records

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background**

37 Many hospitalised patients require rehabilitation during recovery from acute illness. We use
38 routine data from electronic health records (EHR) to report the quantity and intensity of
39 rehabilitation and compared this in patients with and without COVID-19.

40

41 **Methods**

42 We performed a retrospective cohort study of consecutive adults in whom COVID-19 testing was
43 undertaken between March 2020 and August 2021 across three acute hospitals in Scotland. We
44 defined rehabilitation contacts (physiotherapy, occupational therapy, dietetics and speech and
45 language therapy) from timestamped EHR data and determined contact time from a linked
46 workforce planning dataset. We included survivors to hospital discharge who received at least two
47 rehabilitation contacts. The primary outcome was total rehabilitation time. Secondary outcomes
48 included the number of contacts, time to first contact, and rehabilitation minutes per day. A
49 multivariate regression analysis for predictors of rehabilitation time included age, sex,
50 comorbidities, and socioeconomic status.

51

52 **Findings**

53 We included 11,591 consecutive unique patient admissions (76 [63,85] years, 56% female), of
54 which 651 (6%) were with COVID-19, and 10,940 (94%) were admissions with negative testing.
55 There were 128,646 rehabilitation contacts. Patients with COVID-19 received more than double
56 the rehabilitation time compared to those without (365 [165,772] vs 170 [95,350] mins, $p < 0.001$),
57 and this was delivered over more specialist contacts (12 [6,25] vs 6 [3,11], $p < 0.001$). Time to first

58 rehabilitation contact was later in patients with COVID-19 (3 [1,5] vs 2 [1,4] days from admission).
59 Overall, patients with COVID-19 received fewer minutes of rehabilitation per day of admission
60 (14.1 [9.8,18.7] vs 15.6 [10.6,21.3], $p < 0.001$). In our regression analyses, older age and COVID-
61 19 were the most important predictors of increased rehabilitation time.

62

63 **Interpretation**

64 Patients with COVID received more rehabilitation contact time than those without COVID, but
65 this was delivered less intensively. Rehabilitation data derived from the EHR represents a novel
66 measure of delivered hospital care.

67 **Background**

68 The delivery of hospital rehabilitation services during the COVID-19 pandemic presents a serious
69 cause of concern. Survivors of infection have frequently required prolonged and complex
70 rehabilitation. Throughout the pandemic, there has been a rapid change in the delivery of these
71 services across hospitals and in the community. According to data synthesised by the Cochrane
72 Rehabilitation Field,¹ around 25-30% of people infected with COVID-19 in the early phases of the
73 pandemic developed long-COVID with at least one persisting symptom at 6 months from the
74 illness onset. These effects may be profound and impair more than just physical function.² The
75 impact of earlier targeting of rehabilitation on setting the trajectory of recovery remains unclear
76 for those hospitalised with COVID-19, in part due to challenges in quantifying the amount of
77 rehabilitation care delivered in this large patient population. The pathophysiology of these post-
78 acute sequelae is also poorly understood, and their interactions in individuals are unpredictable.³
79
80 Rehabilitation guidelines are based on consensus with a focus on managing acute respiratory issues
81 stemming from COVID-19.⁴⁻⁶ There is broad agreement that individualised treatment plans are
82 required to adapt the delivery of rehabilitation according to factors such as patient frailty and
83 premorbid function.⁷ Individualised rehabilitation plans are common outside of COVID-19, such
84 as in hyperacute rehabilitation for patients with complex neurological disabilities or in the setting
85 of major trauma.⁸ However, applying this approach to patients with COVID-19 would depend on
86 reliable stratification to identify a population at risk of high rehabilitation needs. No previous
87 studies have reported recovery trajectories in patients hospitalised with COVID-19 using
88 systematic measures of rehabilitation delivery. However, many electronic health record (EHR)
89 systems now capture routine data on rehabilitation, including timestamped logs of contacts with

90 specialist providers. This presents new opportunities to understand the interventions delivered to
91 patients and create a novel person-centred outcome measure to better appreciate the effects of acute
92 illness – the specialist rehabilitation time required to achieve recovery to hospital discharge. Prior
93 work using EHR data to understand rehabilitation has been limited to non-hospitalised
94 populations.⁹ Other limitations include not capturing the full hospital admission,^{10,11} or only
95 involving selected types of therapy.¹²

96

97 In this study, we describe the rehabilitation needs of consecutive patients with and without
98 COVID-19 infection across three acute hospitals, using routine EHR data to define the total
99 quantity and intensity of care delivered.

100

101 **Methods**

102 **Study design and participants**

103 We conducted a retrospective cohort study of consecutive unique patients with an acute hospital
104 admission between March 2020 and August 2021 to one of three hospitals in Scotland. Patients
105 were included when at least one severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2)
106 test result was available using reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR).
107 Admissions were classified as with COVID-19 in the event of any positive RT-PCR test during
108 the admission period or in the ten days prior to admission from community testing. All other
109 episodes with at least one negative RT-PCR result were designated as admissions without COVID-
110 19. Individuals were only included for their first hospital admission with COVID-19 in the study
111 period, and in the absence of any such admissions, only for their first hospital admission with
112 negative testing. This created a study cohort of unique patients. Further inclusion criteria required
113 at least two rehabilitation contacts within seven days of admission to identify a population truly
114 engaged by rehabilitation teams rather than simply assessed once without ongoing needs. Patients
115 were excluded from the study cohort if they died during their hospital stay to allow a clearer
116 interpretation of rehabilitation received to achieve hospital discharge. Regardless of symptoms,
117 widespread screening for SARS-CoV-2 was introduced for all hospitalised patients early in the
118 pandemic, creating a large cohort of patients hospitalised without COVID-19.

119

120 **Linked data**

121 The study was performed with the approval of the local Research Ethics Committee and delegated
122 Caldicott Guardian in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All data were collected from
123 EHRs and national registries anonymised and linked by the DataLoch service (Edinburgh, United

124 Kingdom) and analysed within their Secure Data Environment. Consent was not required or sought
125 from individual patients. Baseline characteristics included age, sex, the Scottish Index of Multiple
126 Deprivation (SIMD)¹³ quintile status and the presence of prior coded health conditions (including
127 ischaemic heart disease, myocardial infarction, stroke, diabetes, obesity, dementia, delirium,
128 depression, asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease [COPD]). These morbidities were
129 identified from national administrative records (Scottish Morbidity Record 01) covering prior
130 hospitalisation with relevant ICD-10 codes, using code lists defined previously by the CALIBER
131 research group for each listed condition.¹⁴ These features were also used as confounders for
132 generating and testing an adjusted population using Inverse Probability Treatment Weighting
133 (IPTW) (**appendix p 3, 9**).

134
135 Rehabilitation contact data were obtained from the EHR system (TrakCare, InterSystems, MA) in
136 two formats: a timestamped log of any documented contact by a designated rehabilitation Allied
137 Healthcare Professional (AHP), and a dedicated activity database quantifying the duration in
138 minutes of treatment delivered to individual patients in each session. The activity database is used
139 for workforce planning and service management. Four rehabilitation types were defined by the
140 AHP providing input: physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech and language therapy or
141 dietetics. These databases were linked to produce a table of timestamped contacts by AHP type
142 and minutes of therapy delivered for individual patients in the study cohort. Data imputation using
143 the Moving Weighted Exponential Average (MWEA) was applied to handle any missingness
144 within the recorded minutes of each intervention (**appendix p 4**).

145

146 **Outcomes**

147 The primary outcome was total rehabilitation time, defined as the sum of all rehabilitation contact
148 times across all AHP types, delivered between hospital admission and discharge. Secondary
149 outcomes included the total number of rehabilitation contacts, time from admission to first or
150 second consecutive rehabilitation contact, total rehabilitation time delivered out of hours (outside
151 7 AM to 7 PM), and mean rehabilitation time per day of hospital stay, as a proxy for rehabilitation
152 intensity. Death from any cause at one year after hospital attendance was also determined by
153 linkage with the National Records of Scotland.

154

155 **Statistical analysis**

156 Due to asymptomatic screening, the large group of patients without COVID-19 (94% of
157 admissions) warranted adjustment for potential confounders prior to hospitalisation. An IPTW-
158 adjusted analysis was used to weigh the inverse probability of the exposure (COVID-19 status)
159 given the patient characteristics at baseline.¹⁵ The modified population did not yield significant
160 changes to the underlying model distribution, so this was not used in the primary analyses.
161 However, IPTW-adjusted distribution plots were reported to attempt to adjust for any underlying
162 confounders. Further analyses of the IPTW-generated cohorts are available in **appendix pp 6-8**.

163

164 Normally distributed variables are reported as mean \pm SD, while non-normally distributed
165 variables are described as median [IQR] and differences tested using parametric or non-parametric
166 methods, respectively. For age-based analyses of rehabilitation time, we divided the population
167 into adults below 65 years old (18-64 years) and then balanced the remaining older groups for size
168 (65-82 years and >82 years). Density plots for total rehabilitation time were generated for these
169 age groups and stratified by COVID-19 status. Length of stay was stratified by AHP intervention

170 type to show differences between those receiving or not receiving at least one contact, regardless
171 of COVID-19 status.

172
173 Additionally, we fitted a linear mixed effects regression (LMER) model, estimating predictors of
174 total rehabilitation time (minutes), which was log-transformed due to skewness. We included the
175 following covariates in this model: age, sex, SIMD, comorbidities prior to admission and COVID-
176 19 status. Stepwise feature selection was applied after comparing selection methods and
177 completing other preprocessing steps (described in **appendix pp 12-13**). The remaining covariates
178 (with the resulting exclusion of stroke and COPD) were used to build a simple fixed-effects
179 regression model, which was extended to include random effects terms to control for multi-level
180 interactions that introduced large amounts of unexplained variance within the data. The final model
181 adjusted for SIMD as the random intercept across age groups as the random slopes. The equations
182 describing both fixed and mixed effect models are described in **appendix p 5**.

183
184 The benefits of incorporating random effects into the model fit were evaluated using the AIC score.
185 Chi-squared testing indicated that a model incorporating random intercepts and slopes was more
186 representative than one using only random intercepts ($p < 0.001$). A restricted maximum likelihood
187 (REML) optimisation function was used rather than the standard likelihood estimator due to
188 potential bias in smaller sample sizes within the latter. To conform to the rules applied to random
189 effect variables (particularly intercepts), we sought to include at least five levels, expanding the
190 number of age groups and using SIMD estimates in quintiles. The overall fixed and mixed-effect
191 performance metrics (marginal $R^2 = 0.363$, conditional $R^2 = 0.822$) represented the best fit to the
192 observed data. Further testing of model performance and reliability is described in **appendix p 14**.

193 For the fixed effect variables, the unstandardised beta coefficients b_i were reported alongside their
194 95% confidence intervals (CI). All analyses were conducted in R (version 4.2.0), and significance
195 was considered at $p < 0.05$.

196

197 **Results**

198 **Study population**

199 There were 54,260 eligible index hospital episodes for patients with at least one valid COVID-19
200 test result between March 2020 and August 2021. This was restricted to an analysis cohort of
201 11,591 unique patients after excluding those who died during hospitalisation (n=4,852) or did not
202 receive at least two rehabilitation contacts within seven days of admission (n=37,817). Further
203 details of the data extraction and a summary of rehabilitation contacts data are shown in **Figure 1**.
204 Within the analysis cohort, there were 651 (6%) and 10,940 (94%) patients with and without
205 COVID-19, respectively.

206

207 Across these 11,591 hospital admissions, there were 128,646 rehabilitation contacts, of which
208 13,488 (11%) were delivered to patients with COVID-19. Physiotherapy accounted for nearly two-
209 thirds of all rehabilitation interactions (n=80,290), with a higher proportion of patients with
210 COVID-19 receiving this form of rehabilitation at least once compared to those without COVID-
211 19 (66% vs 62%, p<0.001). The baseline characteristics of patients by COVID-19 status are shown
212 in **Table 1**. Patients without COVID-19 were more likely to be female compared to those with
213 COVID-19 (56% vs 50%, p=0.006), but there were no differences in age (76 [63, 85] vs 75 [60,
214 84], p=0.244) or history of common morbidities. The median length of hospital stay was more than
215 doubled for patients with COVID-19 compared to those without (29 [14, 57] days vs 12 [7, 25]
216 days, respectively, p<0.001). Death within one year of admission was lower in patients who had
217 survived COVID-19 to hospital discharge, compared to those without infection (8% vs 12%,
218 p=0.02).

219

220 **Rehabilitation outcomes**

221 The rehabilitation outcomes for the analysis population are shown in **Table 2**. The median total
222 minutes of rehabilitation was more than doubled in patients with COVID-19 compared to those
223 without (365 [165, 772] vs 170 [95, 350] minutes, $p<0.001$). Similarly, patients with COVID-19
224 received more rehabilitation contacts during their hospital admission (12 [6, 25] vs 6 [3, 11],
225 $p<0.001$). Physiotherapy sessions were the most common intervention types in both groups (14 ± 18
226 vs 6 ± 10 , $p<0.001$). However, as a result of the longer length of stay, the duration of rehabilitation
227 per day was lower in patients with COVID-19 compared to those without (14.1 [9.8, 18.7] vs 15.6
228 [10.6, 21.3] mins, $p<0.001$). Patients with COVID-19 received their first and second rehabilitation
229 contacts later than those without COVID-19 (3 [1, 5] vs 2 [1, 4] days from admission for the first
230 contact; 5 [3, 7] vs 4 [2, 5] days for the second contact, respectively). There were no notable
231 differences in the number of out-of-hours rehabilitation contacts.

232

233 Total rehabilitation time increased with age (**Figure 2**). This was most marked in those who also
234 had COVID-19, such that the median total rehabilitation time in 18-64 year old patients with
235 COVID-19 was longer than for those >82 years without COVID-19 (285 [130, 632] vs 205 [110,
236 405] mins, respectively). The number of pre-existing morbidities did not appear related to total
237 rehabilitation time in those with or without COVID-19 (**appendix p 11**). The overall length of stay
238 was longer in patients with COVID-19, and this variable was skewed with a long tail of prolonged
239 admission times (**appendix p 10**). Receiving any type of AHP rehabilitation contact was
240 associated with an extended hospital stay. This was most notable for patients that required speech
241 and language therapy, where the median length of stay was 28 [12, 65] days compared to 12 [7,
242 23] days in those who did not receive this form of rehabilitation ($p<0.001$, **Figure 3**).

243

Regression analysis

244 The regression model outputs are summarised in **Table 3** (fixed effects) and **appendix p 14**
245 (random effects). COVID-19 status was independently associated with increased total
246 rehabilitation time ($p<0.001$), as was being in the oldest age group >79 years ($p=0.03$), but there
247 were no differences by sex. The SIMD coefficients yielded mixed results using a reference group
248 of the most deprived (quintile 1). There was no significant difference in association seen within
249 the least deprived group (quintile 5), but individuals within quintiles 2 and 3 were more likely to
250 receive higher rehabilitation time ($p=0.001$ and $p=0.002$, respectively). The correlation values
251 between morbidities and rehabilitation time were small compared to the other covariates. Among
252 the conditions included after stepwise selection, only a history of diabetes was associated with
253 longer rehabilitation time ($p=0.016$). Other morbidities were negatively correlated with
254 rehabilitation time, most notably for ischaemic heart disease ($p<0.001$), obesity ($p<0.001$) and
255 asthma ($p<0.001$).

256

257 **Discussion**

258 We report the rehabilitation needs of people hospitalised with and without COVID-19 using
259 routine EHR data. Patients with COVID-19 received more than double the total rehabilitation
260 contacts and time during their hospital stay compared to those with similar baseline characteristics
261 without COVID-19. The total rehabilitation provision was greatest in the oldest patients with
262 COVID-19. However, the rehabilitation time per day was lower for patients with COVID-19,
263 implying a more prolonged recovery but with less intensive treatment. The first rehabilitation
264 contact was also delivered later in those with COVID-19, with a possibility that infection control
265 concerns or severe acute illness may have delayed the initiation of rehabilitation. Our work shows
266 how these data can be successfully extracted from routine EHRs to provide a novel measure of
267 patient recovery from acute hospitalised illness.

268

269 The association between severe infection with COVID-19 and increased rehabilitation needs is
270 understood, although the quantity of these treatments and complex mechanisms driving prolonged
271 recovery time in some individuals remains unclear.³ COVID-19 infection requiring hospital
272 treatment is a clear risk factor for symptom persistence,^{16,17} although much of this evidence comes
273 from early waves of the pandemic in largely unvaccinated populations. Severe infection is a highly
274 catabolic state.¹⁸ The loss of muscle mass in such patients would predictably increase the
275 rehabilitation effort needed to regain sufficient physical function for hospital discharge. However,
276 the effect of rehabilitation intensity early in the infective course is less clear. Our data suggest that
277 those who survived COVID-19 received more rehabilitation overall, but this was spread over more
278 prolonged hospital admissions and was initiated later in the hospital stay. As an observational
279 study, we can only speculate on the direction of the relationship between rehabilitation access and

280 length of hospital stay. It is plausible that COVID-19 patients had limited potential to engage in
281 physical therapy, either because of illness acuity or post-infection complications.

282
283 Early access to rehabilitation following acute illness has been associated with lower mortality rates
284 and better functional outcomes in other non-COVID illnesses.^{19,20} Our data showed a comparative
285 delay of one day in the receipt of a first rehabilitation contact for patients with COVID-19,
286 compared to similar individuals without infection. It is possible that isolation and barrier nursing
287 requirements of infected patients may have limited early access to therapy, which might partly
288 explain the less intensive rehabilitation delivered. There is some evidence for focused or
289 ‘hyperacute’ rehabilitation in dedicated units for COVID-19, with one small study of 100 patients
290 reporting improved recovery in respiratory and muscle function.²¹ However, scaling such services
291 to a vast post-COVID population is challenging. For future infection waves or pandemics, routine
292 EHR data could help identify patients with high predicted rehabilitation needs and focus limited
293 resources on a smaller target population more likely to benefit from intensive treatment.

294
295 Even before the pandemic, ‘hospital-acquired disability’ was growing in attention, with evidence
296 that over a third of older hospitalised patients developed worsening disability by the time of
297 discharge.^{22,23} Our attempts to model the predictors of increased rehabilitation need were limited
298 by the patient variables available in our dataset, but suggested that the oldest patients with higher
299 socioeconomic deprivation required more total rehabilitation time. Those with existing
300 comorbidities tended to receive less rehabilitation in our study. This may initially appear
301 counterintuitive but could reflect a lower target functional level for hospital discharge in these
302 patients. It is also possible that a reduction in function to a new lower baseline is accepted more

303 readily in those with greater medical comorbidity, while more independent patients with better
304 premorbid function may have been given a greater chance to improve with prolonged
305 rehabilitation. Therapeutic nihilism is well recognised in the rehabilitation of patients with
306 dementia,²⁴ despite increasing evidence that meaningful gains can be achieved using tailored
307 techniques.²⁵

308
309 To our knowledge, this is the first study reporting routine AHP specialist contact data from
310 consecutive patients to determine delivered rehabilitation time using the extensive timestamped
311 data available within modern EHR systems. Length of stay is regularly reported as a measure of
312 care quality, with an assumption that effective health services discharge patients from acute
313 services earlier. However, it is also well-recognised that a patient's length of stay is determined by
314 multiple non-clinical factors, including the availability of social care services or access to post-
315 acute care units.²⁶ More fundamentally, using the length of stay as a proxy outcome measure for
316 successful rehabilitation fails to capture the actual treatment delivered to patients. In the United
317 Kingdom, NHS Improvement has developed a visual management system to show 'red' and
318 'green' days during a patient's hospital admission. Red days are where a patient receives little or
319 no value-added care, whereas green days reflect some input to progress a patient towards
320 discharge.²⁷ In one study reviewing a single acute geriatric unit, 54% of admission days were
321 classified as 'red', with most of the inactivity explained by delays waiting for community
322 services.²⁸ Whilst this approach may provide valuable data to focus attention on system
323 weaknesses in delivering efficient acute care, it currently requires manual review of every
324 occupied bed in a hospital unit using a spot audit technique. This is highly inefficient and difficult

325 to scale to a whole hospital or healthcare system. EHR measures of healthcare professional
326 contacts represent a novel approach to reviewing system inactivity in near real-time.

327
328 There are several strengths to our study. We were able to include a large cohort of consecutive
329 patients across multiple acute hospitals due to a shared EHR system. By limiting our analysis to
330 patients with multiple rehabilitation contacts, we created groups of patients with and without
331 COVID-19 who had similar baseline characteristics. By using an integrated health provider
332 dataset, we were able to include contacts from across the entire admission period, including step-
333 down rehabilitation units that are often excluded from hospital-based studies focused only on acute
334 care. However, as a retrospective cohort study, we must acknowledge some limitations to our
335 approach. We can only speculate on the content or the effect of rehabilitation received. Our data
336 show the rehabilitation received by patients but cannot determine unmet needs, which might have
337 varied with clinical pressures during the pandemic. We required some imputation for our
338 rehabilitation time variable, reflecting our use of a workforce planning database which included
339 missing data. The COVID-19 status of our cohort was determined by laboratory testing results and
340 not by clinical status. It is likely that some patients in our group with a positive COVID-19 test
341 were minimally affected by the infection, particularly in the later period of analysis where acquired
342 population immunity had increased. For this analysis, we had access to limited comorbidity
343 information from previous hospitalisation data, and this would be strengthened by wider data
344 linkage, particularly for primary care records.

345
346 In conclusion, we have extracted rehabilitation information from hospital EHRs, showing the
347 increased needs of patients with COVID-19 for prolonged care. Our approach offers an alternative

348 method to understand the complexity of recovery after acute illness, which could form a novel
349 evaluation endpoint for future intervention studies. Rehabilitation contacts and time provides more
350 context to acute hospital care than widely reported measures such as length of hospital stay.

351

352 **Availability of data and materials**

353 This study makes use of several routine electronic health care data sources that are linked, de-
354 identified, and held in a Secure Data Environment (DataLoch), which is accessible by approved
355 individuals who have undertaken the necessary governance training. Summary data can be made
356 available upon request to the corresponding author. All data processing and modelling were
357 conducted in RStudio version 4.2.0 using publicly available libraries through CRAN. The data
358 extraction and cleaning procedures were performed using *tidyverse*, the visualisations were
359 performed using *ggplot2*, the mixed-effects model was fit using *lme4* and the weights for the IPTW
360 adjustments were generated using the *ipw* and *survey* packages. The data analysis code is held in
361 a Secure Data Environment but may be made available for review in a non-disclosive format on
362 discussion with the corresponding author.

363

364 **References**

- 365 [1] Ceravolo MG, Andrenelli E, Arienti C, Côté P, De Sire A, Iannicelli V, et al. Rehabilitation
366 and COVID-19: rapid living systematic review by Cochrane Rehabilitation Field - third
367 edition. Update as of June 30th, 2021. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 2021;57.
368 <https://doi.org/10.23736/S1973-9087.21.07301-9>.
- 369 [2] McPeake J, Shaw M, MacTavish P, Blyth KG, Devine H, Fleming G, et al. Long-term
370 outcomes following severe COVID-19 infection: a propensity matched cohort study. *BMJ*
371 *Open Res* 2021;8:e001080. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjresp-2021-001080>.
- 372 [3] Nalbandian A, Sehgal K, Gupta A, Madhavan MV, McGroder C, Stevens JS, et al. Post-
373 acute COVID-19 syndrome. *Nat Med* 2021;27:601–15. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z)
374 [01283-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z).
- 375 [4] Gu R, Xu S, Li Z, Gu Y, Sun Z. The safety and effectiveness of rehabilitation exercises on
376 COVID-19 patients. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2020;99:e21373.
377 <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000021373>.
- 378 [5] Spruit MA, Holland AE, Singh SJ, Tonia T, Wilson KC, Troosters T. COVID-19: interim
379 guidance on rehabilitation in the hospital and post-hospital phase from a European
380 Respiratory Society- and American Thoracic Society-coordinated international task force.
381 *European Respiratory Journal* 2020;56. <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.02197-2020>.
- 382 [6] Singh et al. British Thoracic Society Guidelines 2020; [https://www.brit-](https://www.brit-thoracic.org.uk/document-library/quality-improvement/covid-19/pulmonary-rehabilitation-for-covid-19-patients/)
383 [thoracic.org.uk/document-library/quality-improvement/covid-19/pulmonary-rehabilitation-](https://www.brit-thoracic.org.uk/document-library/quality-improvement/covid-19/pulmonary-rehabilitation-for-covid-19-patients/)
384 [for-covid-19-patients/](https://www.brit-thoracic.org.uk/document-library/quality-improvement/covid-19/pulmonary-rehabilitation-for-covid-19-patients/).
- 385 [7] Demeco A, Marotta N, Barletta M, Pino I, Marinaro C, Petraroli A, et al. Rehabilitation of
386 patients post-COVID-19 infection: a literature review. *J Int Med Res*
387 2020;48:0300060520948382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0300060520948382>.
- 388 [8] National Guideline Alliance (UK). Identification and assessment of rehabilitation needs
389 after traumatic injury: Rehabilitation After Traumatic Injury: Evidence review A.1/A.2.
390 London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE); 2022.
- 391 [9] Amico P, Pope GC, Meadow A, West P. Episode-Based Payment for the Medicare
392 Outpatient Therapy Benefit. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2016;97:1323–8.
393 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2016.02.028>.
- 394 [10] Prohaska CC, Sottile PD, Nordon-Craft A, Gallagher MD, Burnham EL, Clark BJ, et al.
395 Patterns of utilization and effects of hospital-specific factors on physical, occupational, and
396 speech therapy for critically ill patients with acute respiratory failure in the USA: results of
397 a 5-year sample. *Critical Care* 2019;23:175. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-019-2467-9>.
- 398 [11] Halfon P, Egli Y, Morel Y, Taffé P. The effect of patient, provider and financing
399 regulations on the intensity of ambulatory physical therapy episodes: a multilevel analysis

- 400 based on routinely available data. BMC Health Services Research 2015;15:52.
401 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-0686-6>.
- 402 [12] de Heer HD, Warren M. Physical Therapy and Hospitalization Among Medicare
403 Beneficiaries With Low Back Pain: A Retrospective Cohort Study. Spine 2016;41:1515.
404 <https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0000000000001571>.
- 405 [13] SIMD (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation). Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation n.d.
406 <http://simd.scot/> (accessed February 20, 2023).
- 407 [14] Kuan V, Denaxas S, Gonzalez-Izquierdo A, Direk K, Bhatti O, Husain S, et al. A
408 chronological map of 308 physical and mental health conditions from 4 million individuals
409 in the English National Health Service. The Lancet Digital Health 2019;1:e63–77.
410 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(19\)30012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(19)30012-3).
- 411 [15] Austin PC. An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the Effects of
412 Confounding in Observational Studies. Multivariate Behav Res 2011;46:399–424.
413 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2011.568786>.
- 414 [16] Arnold DT, Hamilton FW, Milne A, Morley AJ, Viner J, Attwood M, et al. Patient
415 outcomes after hospitalisation with COVID-19 and implications for follow-up: results from
416 a prospective UK cohort. Thorax 2021;76:399–401. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-216086>.
- 417
- 418 [17] Bouteleux B, Henrot P, Ernst R, Grassion L, Raheison-Semjen C, Beaufils F, et al.
419 Respiratory rehabilitation for Covid-19 related persistent dyspnoea: A one-year experience.
420 Respiratory Medicine 2021;189:106648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2021.106648>.
- 421 [18] Hosey MM, Needham DM. Survivorship after COVID-19 ICU stay. Nat Rev Dis Primers
422 2020;6:60. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-020-0201-1>.
- 423 [19] Sawada Y, Sasabuchi Y, Nakahara Y, Matsui H, Fushimi K, Haga N, et al. Early
424 Rehabilitation and In-Hospital Mortality in Intensive Care Patients With Community-
425 Acquired Pneumonia. Am J Crit Care 2018;27:97–103.
426 <https://doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2018911>.
- 427 [20] Momosaki R, Yasunaga H, Matsui H, Horiguchi H, Fushimi K, Abo M. Effect of early
428 rehabilitation by physical therapists on in-hospital mortality after aspiration pneumonia in
429 the elderly. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2015;96:205–9.
430 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2014.09.014>.
- 431 [21] Piquet V, Luczak C, Seiler F, Monaury J, Martini A, Ward AB, et al. Do Patients With
432 COVID-19 Benefit from Rehabilitation? Functional Outcomes of the First 100 Patients in a
433 COVID-19 Rehabilitation Unit. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2021;102:1067–74.
434 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2021.01.069>.

- 435 [22] Covinsky K, Pierluissi E, Johnston B. Hospitalization-Associated Disability “She Was
436 Probably Able to Ambulate, but I’m Not Sure.” *JAMA : The Journal of the American*
437 *Medical Association* 2011;306:1782–93. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2011.1556>.
- 438 [23] Covinsky KE, Palmer RM, Fortinsky RH, Counsell SR, Stewart AL, Kresevic D, et al. Loss
439 of independence in activities of daily living in older adults hospitalized with medical
440 illnesses: increased vulnerability with age. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003;51:451–8.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1532-5415.2003.51152.x>.
- 442 [24] Ries JD. A framework for rehabilitation for older adults living with dementia. *Arch*
443 *Physiother* 2022;12:9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40945-022-00134-5>.
- 444 [25] Hall AJ, Febrey S, Goodwin VA. Physical interventions for people with more advanced
445 dementia – a scoping review. *BMC Geriatr* 2021;21:675. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02577-0)
446 [021-02577-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02577-0).
- 447 [26] Brasel KJ, Lim HJ, Nirula R, Weigelt JA. Length of stay: an appropriate quality measure?
448 *Arch Surg* 2007;142:461–5; discussion 465–466.
449 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archsurg.142.5.461>.
- 450 [27] NHS Improvement Red And Green Bed Days n.d. [https://www.england.nhs.uk/south/wp-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/south/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2016/12/rig-red-green-bed-days.pdf)
451 [content/uploads/sites/6/2016/12/rig-red-green-bed-days.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/south/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2016/12/rig-red-green-bed-days.pdf).
- 452 [28] Claffey P, O’Toole R, McCarroll K, Cunningham C, Robinson D. 198Red and Green Bed
453 Day Patient Flow System in an Acute Geriatric Medicine Unit. *Age and Ageing*
454 2017;46:iii13–59. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afx144.198>.
455

456 **Funding**

457 KG is supported by a PhD Fellowship award from the Sir Jules Thorn Charitable Trust (21/01PhD)
458 as part of the University of Edinburgh's Precision Medicine PhD programme. DD is supported by
459 an award from the Medical Research Council (MR/N013166/1). NLM is supported by a Chair
460 Award, Programme Grant, Research Excellence Award (CH/F/21/90010, RG/20/10/34966,
461 RE/18/5/34216) from the British Heart Foundation. This work was supported by DataLoch
462 (dataloch.org), which is core-funded by the Data-Driven Innovation programme within the
463 Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal (ddi.ac.uk), and the Chief Scientist Office,
464 Scottish Government (cso.scot.nhs.uk).

465 **Author contributions**

466 KG and AA conceived the study and its design. KG performed the analysis. DD assisted in refining
467 the methodology. KG and AA had access to and verified the raw data and analysis tables. KG, AA
468 and DD interpreted the data. KG drafted the manuscript. AA, NM, JM, SS and JF revised the
469 manuscript critically for important intellectual content. All authors provided their final approval
470 of the version to be published. All authors are accountable for the work.

471 **Ethics declarations**

472 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

473 This work was reviewed by the DataLoch ethics review panel (LPAC) and approved under Lothian
474 REC approval to this service (Edinburgh, United Kingdom, ref: 17/NS/0072). All data was
475 collected from Electronic Health Records and national registries previously anonymised by the
476 DataLoch service and analysed in a Secure Data Environment. Consent from patients was not
477 required for this study.


478 **Consent for publication**

479 Not applicable

480 **Competing interests**

481 All authors have reported that they have no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to
482 disclose.


483



484


Figure 1. Summary of data flow into study.

Total rehabilitation contact duration stratified by age group



485

486 **Figure 2.** Distribution of IPTW-adjusted total rehabilitation time across the groups with and without COVID-19
487 stratified by three age categories. Vertical dashed lines represent the group median.



488

Figure 3. Distribution of the IPTW-adjusted hospital length of stay in days for patients who did and did not receive at least one specific AHP rehabilitation contacts: A – physiotherapy; B – occupational therapy; C – speech and language therapy; D – dietetics. Vertical dashed lines represent the group median.

489 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics.

| Characteristic | All (n=11,591) | COVID-19 negative (n=10,940) | COVID-19 positive (n=651) | p |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|
| Age, years (median, IQR) | 76 (63, 85) | 76 (63, 85) | 75 (60, 84) | 0.244 |
| Sex | .. | .. | .. | 0.006 |
| Male | 5,154 (44) | 4,831 (44) | 323 (50) | .. |
| Female | 6,437 (56) | 6,109 (56) | 328 (50) | .. |
| SIMD in quintiles | .. | .. | .. | 0.159 |
| 1 (most deprived) | 1,507 (13) | 1,416 (13) | 91 (14) | .. |
| 2 | 2,841 (25) | 2,666 (24) | 175 (27) | .. |
| 3 | 2,086 (18) | 1,986 (18) | 100 (15) | .. |
| 4 | 1,996 (17) | 1,875 (17) | 121 (19) | .. |
| 5 (least deprived) | 3,161 (27) | 2,997 (27) | 164 (25) | .. |
| IHD | 1,394 (12) | 1,324 (12) | 70 (11) | 0.304 |
| Stroke | 781 (7) | 744 (7) | 37 (6) | 0.269 |
| Myocardial infarction | 646 (6) | 618 (6) | 28 (4) | 0.145 |
| Diabetes | 1,322 (11) | 1,260 (12) | 62 (10) | 0.12 |
| Obesity | 422 (4) | 391 (4) | 31 (5) | 0.116 |
| Dementia | 459 (4) | 429 (4) | 30 (5) | 0.383 |
| Delirium | 963 (8) | 899 (8) | 64 (10) | 0.147 |
| Depression | 589 (5) | 561 (5) | 28 (4) | 0.351 |
| Asthma | 721 (6) | 679 (6) | 42 (7) | 0.801 |
| COPD | 1,028 (9) | 975 (9) | 53 (8) | 0.501 |
| Length of stay, days (median, IQR) | 12.7 (7.0, 26.4) | 12.2 (6.9, 24.8) | 28.6 (13.9, 56.8) | <0.001 |
| Death at 1 year | 1,422 (12) | 1,367 (12) | 55 (8) | 0.02 |

509 Values are number (%) unless stated otherwise. SIMD – Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation;
 510 IHD – Ischaemic Heart Disease; COPD – Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
 511

512 **Table 2.** Rehabilitation outcomes.

| 513 514 515 516 517 | Characteristic | All (n=11,591) | COVID-19 negative (n=10,940) | COVID-19 positive (n=651) | p |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| 518 | Total minutes of rehabilitation | 175 (95, 370) | 170 (95, 350) | 365 (165, 772) | <0.001 |
| 519 | Number of interventions | 6 (3, 12) | 6 (3, 11) | 12 (6, 25) | <0.001 |
| 520 | Physiotherapy contacts (mean, SD) | 6.93 (10.82) | 6.53 (10.05) | 13.65 (18.43) | <0.001 |
| 521 | Occupational therapy contacts (mean, SD) | 2.61 (4.96) | 2.54 (4.9) | 3.91 (5.72) | <0.001 |
| 522 | Speech & Language therapy contacts (mean, SD) | 0.58 (3.16) | 0.56 (3.13) | 0.76 (3.57) | <0.001 |
| 523 | Dietetics contacts (mean, SD) | 0.98 (2.93) | 0.9 (2.78) | 2.39 (4.53) | <0.001 |
| 524 | Time to first contact (days) | 2 (1, 4) | 2 (1, 4) | 3 (1, 5) | <0.001 |
| 525 | Time to second 7-day contact (days) | 4 (2, 6) | 4 (2, 5) | 5 (3, 7) | <0.001 |
| 526 | Total minutes of out-of-hours rehabilitation (mean, SD) | 0.67 (6.99) | 0.66 (6.96) | 0.68 (7.54) | 0.642 |
| 527 | Minutes of rehabilitation per day of hospitalisation | 15.5 (10.45, 21.11) | 15.62 (10.55, 21.25) | 14.06 (9.83, 18.73) | <0.001 |

528 All values are median (IQR) unless specified otherwise. Out-of-hours treatment is defined as any rehabilitation
529 contact between 7pm and 7am on any day.
530
531
532
533

534

Table 3. Linear mixed effects regression model for predictors of total rehabilitation time

| | | log(Total minutes of rehabilitation) | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Predictors | | Estimates | 95% CI | p |
| Age groups | 18-29 | Reference group | .. | .. |
| | 30-49 | 0.08 | [-0.29, 0.45] | 0.662 |
| | 50-65 | 0.17 | [-0.42, 0.76] | 0.563 |
| | 66-79 | 0.2 | [-1.24, 1.65] | 0.782 |
| | Above 79 | 0.6 | [0.06, 1.15] | 0.031 |
| Sex | Male | Reference group | .. | .. |
| | Female | 0.02 | [-0.01, 0.05] | 0.144 |
| SIMD (Quintiles) | 1 (most deprived) | Reference group | .. | .. |
| | 2 | 2.05 | [0.89, 3.2] | 0.001 |
| | 3 | 2.09 | [0.8, 3.38] | 0.002 |
| | 4 | -0.75 | [-2.01, 0.5] | 0.24 |
| | 5 (least deprived) | -0.65 | [-1.87, 0.57] | 0.294 |
| Comorbidity | Ischaemic Heart Disease | -0.13 | [-0.18, -0.07] | <0.001 |
| | Myocardial Infarction | -0.13 | [-0.22, -0.05] | 0.002 |
| | Diabetes | 0.06 | [0.01, 0.1] | 0.016 |
| | Obesity | -0.16 | [-0.24, -0.07] | <0.001 |
| | Dementia | -0.09 | [-0.17, -0.02] | 0.015 |
| | Delirium | -0.05 | [-0.1, 0.01] | 0.085 |
| | Depression | -0.08 | [-0.15, -0.01] | 0.036 |
| | Asthma | -0.17 | [-0.23, -0.11] | <0.001 |
| COVID-19 status | Negative | Reference group | .. | .. |
| | Positive | 0.67 | [0.64, 0.69] | <0.001 |

Beta-coefficient estimates shown from a LMER model using SIMD as the random intercept and age group as the random slope terms. The reference groups for the comorbidities are patients without these conditions.