DOI: 10.5152/TurkThoracJ.2019.166

[Abstract:0503] OP-019 [Accepted: Oral Presentation] [Pulmonary Rehabilitation and Chronic Care]

Evaluation of Patients Who Underwent Pulmonary Rehabilitation with An Interval of One Year

Sabri Serhan Olcay[1], Canan Göktepe[1], Sevinç Sütlü[2]

[1]Department of Pulmonary Rehabilitation, Burdur State Hospital, Burdur, Turkey
[2]Burdur State Health Care Department, Burdur, Turkey

Objectives: Pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) program for patients with chronic respiratory problems increases the patients quality of life and increases their exercise capacity. In order to maintain improvement in exercise capacity and quality of life, patients should continue to exercise after the program. The aim of this study is to compare the pre- and post-program findings of the patients who were included in the PR program with a one-year interval and to determine their gains.

Methods: Nine patients (7 asthma, 2 copd) who underwent PR for the second time were included in the study. 6 minutes walking distance, respiratory function tests, dyspnea perception and leg fatigue (MRC-BORG Scale), disease specific (SGRQ) quality of life and hospital anxiety depression scale were evaluated before and after the two programs.

Results: When the pre-PR program findings of the patients were compared, it was observed that the FEV_1, leg fatigue and quality of life were significantly better in second year than the first year. However, when the post-program data were compared, it was found that there was no statistically significant differance accept decreasing leg fatigue compared to first year. After the second PR application, a statistically significant increase was found in only 6 minutes walking distance.

Conclusion: The initial value of the patients participating in the second time PR program is better than the initial values of the first program. So we can say that the gains after the first program can be preserved after 1 year. The increase in FEV_1 can be associated with superior number of asthmatic patients in the study. When the outcomes after both PR programs were compared, the reason for the lower number of gains at the end of the second program could be explained by the fact that the patients started second PR program with significantly good parameters. The increase in the 6-minute walking distance was the only gain as a result of the second PR application shows the necessity of conducting studies to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the second apply to PR program.

Keywords: Asthma, COPD, pulmonary rehabilitation, repetition of treatment