

1 **TITLE: Telerehabilitation services have declined post-COVID-19**

2 **Authors:** Anthony K May PhD¹, Anne E Holland PhD^{1,2,3}, Jennifer A Alison PhD⁴, Kelcie

3 Herrmann⁵, Narelle S Cox PhD^{1,2*}

4 **Affiliations:**

5 1, Respiratory Research@Alfred, Monash University, VIC, Australia; 2, Institute for Breathing

6 and Sleep, VIC, Australia; 3, Department of Physiotherapy, Alfred Health, VIC, Australia; 4,

7 Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney School of Health Sciences, The University of Sydney,

8 NSW, Australia; 5, Lung Foundation Australia, QLD, Australia

9 ***Correspondence:**

10 Dr Narelle S Cox. Email: Narelle.Cox@monash.edu

11 Address: Respiratory Research@Alfred, Monash University, Level 6, The Alfred Centre, 99

12 Commercial Rd, Melbourne, Victoria, 3004, Australia

13 **Notation of prior abstract publication/presentation:** Abstract/poster presentation:

14 TSANZSRS 2024 annual scientific meeting

15 **Funding information:** No funding was received for this research. NSC and AEH receive

16 research fellowship support from the National Health and Medical Research Council

17 (NHMRC) (GNT2016286 and GNT1197007, respectively).

18 **Conflict of interest statement:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

19 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to extend our thanks Emma Halloran for her input

20 during survey development.

21

22 **Abstract**

23 **Objective:** To characterize Pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) service delivery, investigate the
24 impact of the pandemic on PR services, and describe centre-based PR (CBPR) and
25 telerehabilitation with reference to PR essential components.

26 **Design:** Online national cross-sectional survey.

27 **Setting:** Australian PR services.

28 **Participants:** Representatives of PR programs listed within the Lung Foundation Australia
29 national database (n=295).

30 **Interventions:** Not applicable.

31 **Main Outcome Measure(s):** Availability of PR in CBPR and telerehabilitation settings.

32 **Results:** 97% of Australian PR services (n=114/117) delivered CBPR, similarly to pre-COVID-
33 19 pandemic availability (96%). 43% (n=50/116) of services delivered telerehabilitation,
34 which was significantly less than availability during COVID-19 restrictions (74%; $p < 0.001$).
35 CBPR was primarily delivered in a group setting (99%; median (IQR) 7 (6-8)
36 participants/group), and telerehabilitation primarily via individual telephone calls (94%).
37 39% of respondents report CBPR group size has reduced. PR essential components of initial
38 centre-based assessments and individually prescribed/progressed endurance and resistance
39 training were achieved by most CBPR and telerehabilitation programs. Staff training in
40 delivery of telerehabilitation models was undertaken in 33% of services.

41 **Conclusions:** PR essential components are generally met in current Australian programs.

42 However, telerehabilitation services and CBPR program capacity have declined indicating

43 reduced program capacity. Sustainability of effective PR programs is required to support
44 access for people with chronic respiratory diseases.

45

46 **Keywords:** Telerehabilitation, pulmonary rehabilitation, chronic respiratory disease, service
47 delivery, telehealth

48

49 **Abbreviations list:**

50 CBPR = Centre-based pulmonary rehabilitation

51 IQR = Interquartile range

52 PR = Pulmonary rehabilitation

53 **Introduction**

54 Pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) is a highly effective, yet widely underused treatment for
55 people with chronic respiratory disease [1, 2]. Typically, PR is an 8-12 week program
56 delivered within a hospital or healthcare centre [2]. Limited program availability and patient-
57 related barriers to centre-based PR (CBPR) attendance have increased interest in alternative
58 PR models utilising telerehabilitation to improve program access [2, 3, 4]. Telerehabilitation
59 use expanded during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, post-pandemic it is unclear how
60 many services continue to deliver CBPR and telerehabilitation.

61 Telerehabilitation programs may use synchronous (e.g. telephone calls, video-conferencing)
62 or asynchronous communication (e.g. email) [3], and can be available across a variety of
63 platforms. A recent Cochrane review has demonstrated that telerehabilitation achieves
64 similar clinical outcomes to CBPR with greater program completion rates [4]. For
65 telerehabilitation to be a clinically acceptable alternative to CBPR, models should meet
66 similar standards to CBPR in delivering essential components of effective PR [5]. Defined PR
67 essential components include initial centre-based assessment, individually
68 prescribed/progressed endurance and resistance training, and delivery by healthcare
69 professionals trained in the specific telerehabilitation model [1]. The extent to which
70 telerehabilitation models deliver essential components of PR in clinical practice is not clear.

71 This study aimed to characterise PR service delivery, investigate the impact of the pandemic
72 on PR services, and describe CBPR and telerehabilitation with reference to PR essential
73 components.

74

75 **Methods**

76 An online, cross-sectional survey was undertaken between July 19 and August 28, 2023
77 (Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA), with pilot testing prior to launch. Email invitations for voluntary
78 anonymous survey completion were sent to all PR programs within the Lung Foundation
79 Australia national database, the most comprehensive record of programs available. Ethics
80 approval was granted prospectively (Monash University (ID 39264)).

81 The survey comprised twenty-seven questions (plus sub-questions as required) that
82 explored the study aims. Demographic information relating to respondent role and PR
83 service setting were collected.

84 All responses received, including from incomplete surveys, were included in data analysis
85 (IBM SPSS Statistics V28.0 (IBM Corp., NY, USA)). Descriptive statistics were reported
86 (number (%) or median (interquartile range (IQR))). Open responses were coded
87 thematically. Service availability at the time of survey completion was compared with
88 availability pre-COVID-19 pandemic for CBPR, and during the pandemic (2020-22) for
89 telerehabilitation (McNemar's test; significance $p < 0.05$).

90

91 **Results**

92 Survey invitations were sent to 295 PR programs with 117 responses received (40% response
93 rate; n=9 (8%) incomplete). 92% of respondents were the service PR coordinator. For PR
94 service availability and respondent demographics see Figure 1.

95 97% of respondents (n=114/117) reported delivery of CBPR at survey completion (Figure 1),
96 similar to pre-pandemic CBPR availability (96%). CBPR was primarily delivered in a group

97 setting (n=109/110, 99%), to median (IQR) 7 (6-8) participants/group, which 39% of
98 respondents (n=42/109) reported to be smaller than pre-pandemic group size. The most
99 common CBPR training modalities were walking (90%), free/machine weights (78%),
100 stationery cycling (68%) and resistance bands (53%).

101 During the pandemic, 74% of respondents (n=85/114) delivered telerehabilitation, which
102 had declined significantly at the time of survey completion (43%, n=50/116; p<0.001) (Figure
103 1). The most cited reasons for telerehabilitation cessation were staffing limitations, patient
104 preference for CBPR, and staff perception for greater ease/benefits of CBPR. All services
105 except one delivered telerehabilitation in addition to CBPR. Multiple telerehabilitation
106 models were used, including telephone (94%), video-interaction (60%) and email (34%). Of
107 synchronous (video) telerehabilitation programs (n=28), group video-conferencing (n=11/28,
108 39%; median (IQR) 3 (2-4) participants/session) was less commonly delivered than 1:1 video-
109 calls (n=26/28, 93%). The most common telerehabilitation training modalities were walking
110 (89%), free/machine weights (63%), bodyweight resistance exercises (58%) and resistance
111 bands (50%).

112 The essential component of initial centre-based assessment was performed in 100% of CBPR
113 and 89% of telerehabilitation programs (Figure 1), while individually prescribed/progressed
114 endurance and resistance training was delivered by most CBPR (91%) but fewer
115 telerehabilitation programs (78%). Staff training in the delivery of specific telerehabilitation
116 models was undertaken in 33% of services (n=15/45).

117

118 **Discussion**

119 This study characterises availability and delivery of PR in Australia. CBPR program availability
120 is largely consistent with pre-pandemic levels, but with reduced group size. Meanwhile,
121 telerehabilitation availability has declined compared with during COVID-19 restrictions,
122 although remains higher than pre-pandemic [6, 7]. The majority of telerehabilitation
123 programs complied with PR essential components.

124 The decline in telerehabilitation availability post-COVID reflects a trend across telemedicine
125 more broadly. Increasing patient preference for in-person consultation, waning concerns
126 about COVID-19 infection and variable administrative and regulatory support for hybrid care
127 delivery models (i.e. face-to-face and telehealth) have all been posed as contributors to
128 reduced telehealth availability [8]. Given that telerehabilitation is a recommended
129 alternative to CBPR in international guidelines [2], and clinical services demonstrated ability
130 to deliver telerehabilitation under COVID conditions, understanding the factors that
131 underpin reduced telerehabilitation provision currently is important if models are to be
132 sustainable.

133 While most telerehabilitation programs complied with essential components of centre-
134 based assessment and exercise training prescription/progression, relatively few provided
135 telerehabilitation model-specific training. Experience and competency with technology are
136 known factors in the successful delivery of remote healthcare [9]. Whether enhanced
137 telerehabilitation model-specific training would improve clinician confidence and acceptance
138 of telerehabilitation, leading to greater service availability, remains to be determined.

139 Potential to improve PR service access is a proposed benefit of telerehabilitation models [1,
140 2]. This study highlighted reduced CBPR group size post-pandemic, along with few
141 telerehabilitation models being delivered in a group format. This creates the very real

142 possibility that overall PR program capacity has actually reduced post-pandemic, further
143 impeding program access for patients. Whether changes in program funding, or other
144 contributors such as referral practices, have contributed to reduced service capacity requires
145 exploration. In Australia, healthcare is largely funded under a universal scheme for
146 subsidisation and reimbursement, however in regions where PR reimbursement is complex,
147 such as the US, fluctuating service availability based on financial drivers may have profound
148 effects on access to PR for patients [5].

149 The cross-sectional nature of this work relied upon participant recollection of service
150 delivery over the previous 4-year period. This need for recall, coupled with potential for staff
151 changes during the intervening period, may have impacted historical program knowledge
152 held by the respondent. The response rate for this study was 40%. This may be attributed to
153 the online method of survey delivery without incentive [10]. However, given that all
154 Australian states and territories are represented, including rural, regional and metropolitan
155 services, we believe the data to be largely reflective of the current state of Australian PR.

156

157 **Conclusions**

158 Most Australian telerehabilitation programs currently meet PR essential components,
159 supporting the ability of such models to deliver effective PR programs. However,
160 telerehabilitation services and CBPR program capacity have both declined post-COVID
161 highlighting the importance of ensuring sustainability of effective PR programs, irrespective
162 of model of delivery, to support widespread access to this recommended treatment.

163 **References**

- 164 1. Holland AE, Cox NS, Houchen-Wolloff L, et al. Defining modern pulmonary
165 rehabilitation. An official American Thoracic Society Workshop Report. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*.
166 2021;18(5):e12-e29.
- 167 2. Rochester CL, Alison JA, Carlin B, et al. Pulmonary rehabilitation for adults with
168 chronic respiratory disease: An official American Thoracic Society Clinical Practice Guideline.
169 *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2023;208(4):e7-e26.
- 170 3. Bhatt SP, Rochester CL. Expanding implementation of tele-pulmonary rehabilitation:
171 The new frontier. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. 2022;19(1):3-5.
- 172 4. Cox NS, Dal Corso S, Hansen H, et al. Telerehabilitation for chronic respiratory
173 disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2021;1:CD013040(1).
- 174 5. Bhatt SP, Casaburi R, Mosher CL, et al. Telehealth pulmonary rehabilitation: A call for
175 minimum standards. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*.210(2):156-46.
- 176 6. Spruit MA, Pitta F, Garvey C, et al. Differences in content and organisational aspects
177 of pulmonary rehabilitation programmes. *Eur Respir J*. 2014;43(5):1326-37.
- 178 7. Johnston CL, Maxwell LJ, Alison JA. Pulmonary rehabilitation in Australia: A national
179 survey. *Physiotherapy*. 2011;97(4):284-90.
- 180 8. Huang J, Yeung AM, Eiland LA, et al. Telehealth Fatigue: Is It Real? What Should Be
181 Done? *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2024;18(1):196-200.
- 182 9. Inskip JA, Lauscher HN, Li LC, et al. Patient and health care professional perspectives
183 on using telehealth to deliver pulmonary rehabilitation. *Chron Respir Dis*. 2018;15(1):71-80.
- 184 10. Shih T, Fan X. Comparing response rates in e-mail and paper surveys: A meta-analysis.
185 *Educ Res Rev*. 2009;4(1):26-40.

186

187 **Figure legend**

188 Figure 1: Summary of Australian pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) services and programs.

189 * $p < 0.001$ vs. 2023 (McNemar test).

190 A Telephone; B Video-call/conference; C Email; D Postal service; E Desktop or mobile

191 application; F Text message.



192 ACT Australian Capital Territory; NSW New South Wales; NT Northern Territory; QLD

193 Queensland; SA South Australia; TAS Tasmania; VIC Victoria; WA Western Australia.

Respondents



- 45% Physiotherapist
- 40% Nurse
- 10% Exercise physiologist
- 5% Other



Metropolitan 42%



Regional 23%



Rural 35%

PR services

PR program structure

Centre-based PR

114 services (2023)
112 prior to COVID-19

Program duration
7+ weeks 95%

Session duration median
60 min (IQR 60-90)

1:1 delivery 35%

Group delivery 99%

Group size median
7 patients (IQR 6-8)

Telerehabilitation

50 services (2023)
85 during COVID-19*



A 94%



B 60%



C 34%



D 28%



E 21%



F 17%

Telephone

Program duration
7+ weeks 80%

Session duration median
30 min (IQR 20-30)

Video-call / conferencing

Program duration
7+ weeks 89%

Session duration median
5 min (IQR 30-60)

1:1 delivery 93%

Group delivery 39%

Group size median
3 patients (IQR 2-4)