

Perioperative exercise programmes to promote physical activity in the medium to long term: systematic review and qualitative research

Michael W Pritchard,¹ Amy Robinson,¹
Sharon R Lewis,² Suse V Gibson,³ Antony Chuter,⁴
Robert Copeland,⁵ Euan Lawson⁶ and
Andrew F Smith^{7*}

¹Lancaster Patient Safety Research Unit, Royal Lancaster Infirmary, Lancaster, UK

²Bone and Joint Health, Blizard Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK

³Department of Health and Care, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK

⁴Patient and public involvement representative, Sussex, UK

⁵Centre for Sport and Exercise Health, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK

⁶Lancaster Medical School, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK

⁷Department of Anaesthesia, Royal Lancaster Infirmary, Lancaster, UK

*Corresponding author Andrew.Smith@mbht.nhs.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Robert Copeland reports grants from Yorkshire Cancer Research (Harrogate, UK). Suse V Gibson reports a studentship grant from the National Institute for Health and Care Research Applied Research Collaboration North West Coast (University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK), paid to the University of Central Lancashire (Preston, UK). Andrew F Smith reports grants from the European Society of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care (Brussels, Belgium), and that he is a co-ordinating editor for the Cochrane Anaesthesia Review Group, an editor of *Anaesthesia* and a performance assessor/team leader on the General Medical Council (London, UK). He also reports consulting fees (personal payment for advice on new airway devices).

Published July 2022

DOI: 10.3310/NZPN0787

Scientific summary

Perioperative exercise programmes to promote physical activity

Health and Social Care Delivery Research 2022; Vol. 10: No. 21

DOI: 10.3310/NZPN0787

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

In England alone, more than 4 million hospital admissions lead to surgery each year. The perioperative health-care encounter (from the initial presentation in primary care to postoperative return to function) offers the potential for substantial health gains in the wider sense and over the longer term.

Aims and objectives

This project aimed to examine a broad range of evidence and knowledge to identify, and set in context, interventions applied during the perioperative period to promote or enable physical activity and exercise in the medium to long term. To do this, we undertook a systematic review and conducted focus group and individual interviews with those running services designed to promote physical activity. We aimed to understand the practical and contextual factors that make such interventions 'work', and to synthesise the findings from these research approaches.

Systematic review

Methods

We included randomised controlled trials and quasi-randomised trials, with adult participants (aged ≥ 18 years), in which at least 60% were scheduled to undergo, or had recently undergone, a surgical procedure. We also included non-randomised studies; because we found a sufficient number of randomised trials, the non-randomised studies provided a supplementary set to the review findings.

We included interventions that encouraged participants to engage in physical activity. These were interventions that took place in a group (such as a fitness class) or on a one-to-one level, and either were or were not individualised to a participant's needs. We included comparisons that were described by study investigators as 'usual care' or were another type of intervention.

We included studies that measured and reported our primary outcomes: (1) the amount of physical activity conducted at the end of follow-up (e.g. mean number of steps measured using a step counter) and (2) the number of people who were engaging in physical activity at the end of follow-up (e.g. measured in a self-reported questionnaire). Secondary outcomes were (1) physical fitness, (2) health-related quality of life at the end of follow-up, (3) pain, (4) adverse events, (5) adherence and (6) participants' experiences of taking part in the programme.

We searched the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature, EMBASE, PsycInfo and SPORTDiscus in October 2020. We also searched clinical trials databases and conducted backward and forward citation searches.

Two review authors independently assessed studies for inclusion and extracted data. We used standard review methods throughout; we assessed the risk of bias in randomised controlled trials and used the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation approach to assess the certainty of the evidence.

Results

We found 53 studies (51 randomised controlled trials and two quasi-randomised trials) with 8604 participants reporting the effects of 67 interventions. Surgical indications were cancer ($n = 11$ studies), cardiac ($n = 12$), bariatric ($n = 8$), and hip and knee replacements ($n = 12$); the remaining studies were for a broad range of indications.

In more than two-thirds of studies, interventions were started postoperatively; smaller numbers reported preoperative initiation ($n = 4$), or a mixture of pre- and postoperative initiation ($n = 10$). Interventions more often involved multiple components or modes of delivery (55.2% of studies). These components tended to fall into three categories: education and advice, including the provision of written or verbal information and advice (82.1% of studies), physical activity recommendations or a formal exercise prescription; behavioural mechanisms, which focused on behaviour change theories, usually through therapeutic approaches including counselling or motivational interviewing (59.7% of studies); and direct physical activity instruction in the form of group classes or one-to-one sessions (44.8% of studies).

We analysed our results separately according to whether the intervention was compared with 'usual care' or with another intervention.

Intervention versus 'usual care'

- Amount of physical activity (37 studies, 4969 participants). We found moderate-certainty evidence that physical activity interventions may increase the amount of physical activity 6–12 months after surgery. This was evaluated using a range of measurement values, which we pooled in separate analyses. Most studies and participants (12 studies, 1947 participants) reported measurements as minutes per day or week; a small increase in physical activity was demonstrated when participants received the intervention [standardised mean difference (SMD) 0.15, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.04 to 0.27]. There was a consistent finding across all measures that the intervention may increase the likelihood that people would do more physical activity.
- Engagement in physical activity (10 studies, 1097 participants). We found moderate-certainty evidence that interventions probably slightly increase people's engagement in physical activity, compared with usual care [risk ratio (RR) 1.19, 95% CI 0.96 to 1.47; nine studies, 882 participants]. In these results, 60 more participants per 1000 would still be engaging in physical activity at the end of follow-up after receiving the intervention. However, the wide CI in the effect estimate indicates that some people receiving the intervention may do less physical activity. Incomplete data from another study were available but were not included in the analysis.
- Physical fitness (15 studies, 1031 participants). Again, the outcome was evaluated using various measures that may reflect the age of participants or the reason for surgery, or both. In general, we noted a similar trend that suggested an improvement in fitness when people had received a physical activity intervention, but this low-certainty evidence included the possibility that interventions may or may not improve physical fitness 6–12 months after surgery.
- Health-related quality of life (22 studies, 3015 participants). We found moderate-certainty evidence that physical activity interventions probably slightly increased health-related quality of life at the end of follow-up. Although the primary analysis showed a slight reduction in quality of life as well as an increase, the findings more clearly favoured the physical activity interventions once we removed studies at high and unclear risks of bias from the analysis (SMD 0.17, 95% CI 0.01 to 0.33; 12 studies, 2167 participants).
- Pain (11 studies, 1057 participants). Again, the findings for pain tended to favour the intervention. However, the estimates were all imprecise and included possible benefits and harms; the certainty of this evidence was low.
- Adherence (15 studies, 786 participants). The range of adherence was between 47% and 93%. However, definitions of adherence varied between studies, and because the designs of interventions differed significantly it was not reasonable to draw confident conclusions about adherence to all physical activity interventions; we judged the certainty of this evidence to be very low.

- Adverse events (10 studies, 1410 participants). Few studies reported adverse events data and the certainty of this evidence was very low. Most events were described as not serious and unrelated to the intervention. The few events described as possibly related to the intervention were reported for only 30 participants.
- Participants' experiences of intervention (four studies, 159 participants). Very few studies reported details of participants' experiences. Feedback was generally positive, and participants were satisfied and/or felt that they had benefited from being able to engage with the intervention. We did not downgrade the certainty of this narrative evidence.

Intervention versus intervention

Only seven studies compared one intervention with another intervention, and the differences in these interventions meant that it was often not feasible to combine data in analysis. The effects from most studies generally indicated little difference between intervention designs. One study found improved engagement with physical activity after using a clinic-based intervention, compared with a home-based intervention; one small study found improved health-related quality of life with a home-based intervention, compared with a centre-based intervention; and another small study found improvement in pain with a home-based intervention, compared with a centre-based intervention. But these findings were not comparable with those of other studies, and we judged all the evidence, which was sparse and generally inconclusive, to be of very low certainty.

Case study enquiry

We sought existing services that were already promoting physical activity to people scheduled to undergo, or who had recently undergone, surgery. We noted that services appeared to fit within one of six 'models' of care: (1) spanning primary and secondary care; (2) being embedded within specialist services; (3) relying on partnerships between community non-health service providers and national health services; (4) being community or patient led; (5) 'low-resource' interventions, but which appear to be effective; and (6) offering residential and/or extended (≥ 18 months) support. An annotated compendium of these is presented in the main report.

We conducted two focus group events and two individual interviews (with nine participants from eight UK-based services), using a topic guide developed together with our patient representative. The online focus group discussions and interviews were conducted between November 2020 and January 2021 during national restrictions owing to the COVID-19 pandemic. These were recorded, transcribed and then analysed by one of the research team working with our patient representative to generate a list of initial codes. These were developed iteratively into three overarching themes, presented below.

Narratives of physical activity promotion

It was clear that how activity was 'framed' to patients was important in recruiting them to and retaining them in programmes. This was focused around three key principles: first, that programmes take a holistic, well-being approach; second, that programmes aim to motivate, inspire and support self-efficacy for 'exercise'; and, third, that programmes and narratives of physical activity are embedded in usual care. It was evident that there is not a single activity, or 'dose' of activity, for every patient and that finding something that people enjoy and building on that is the best way to increase people's activity and make new habits. There is a clinical/non-clinical paradox, such that if physical activity is presented to patients as a 'clinical' intervention (i.e. as part of their treatment), then they are more likely to engage than if it is not. However, the actual interventions are better delivered in non-clinical settings. Finally, although services were nominally set up to promote physical activity, they in fact provide a wider range of benefits, both intended and unexpected, on mental health and well-being.

Setting up and running the service

Establishing services was often cross-disciplinary, driven by enthusiasts, and more likely to succeed with the support of managers and wider clinical colleagues. Co-designing and listening to patients, as well as a continuous learning culture, were seen as important in helping to shape the best provision. Activity as treatment is a necessary message to engendering wider support from colleagues, but their support is sometimes reliant on framing physical activity to their particular health perspective, building trust and good relationships, providing evidence and having a lot of perseverance. Senior 'clinical champions' could aid service development. In this respect, too, patients can act as 'allies' in promoting the service; if patients are impressed by the service, they are more likely to share this with their clinical team, which can lead to further referrals. Services were typically provided by a number of health-care professionals, with support from others such as staff at local gyms. The personal qualities of staff, for example having the capacity for empathy, kindness and excellent communication, are more important than their professional background. Data collection was seen as a key part of programme activity: to evaluate processes and outcomes, to help convince clinical and managerial colleagues of the utility of the service and to help secure further funding.

Digital delivery: the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond

Although the COVID-19 pandemic presented substantial challenges for services, the period also presented an opportunity to consider new ways of working with patients. To varying degrees, services maintained contact with patients through heavy use of social media and follow-along videos to help keep people moving, as well as telephone and e-mail contact, some provision of resources, online exercise diaries and some live group sessions. One service described a full spectrum adaption to their provision, providing home exercise packs and telephone calls for people with no technical abilities or access to devices/the internet up to a full timetable of online classes and digital heart rate monitors that meant patients could be live-tracked for safety and encouragement by physical activity trainers. They saw positive results and high engagement. However, other services gave mixed views; several indicated that new methods of engagement were not as effective as face-to-face encouragement and participation, and many acknowledged inequalities in access to the necessary technology, thereby compounding disadvantage. However, services indicated that they would explore hybrid delivery models beyond the pandemic that blended some of the new digital or remote approaches they had begun with their original models of delivery. This was seen as potentially benefiting certain groups, such as patients receiving chemotherapy or those with caring responsibilities who might find it more difficult to travel to sessions.

Synthesis of findings

Although collected using different methodologies and with different intentions, the findings from the systematic review and the qualitative work offer complementary perspectives on the same issue. However, the qualitative work indicates that many factors are at play in ensuring a successful outcome (such as the framing of physical activity, 'buy-in' from wider colleagues and the space/place in which physical activity is delivered), but these were often not described or explored in the studies, where the focus tended to be on demographic characteristics of participants, rather than wider structural considerations at the organisation level. We noted that data collection was an important evaluation tool for trials and for services. Services often drew on patient experience and feedback in the evolution and ongoing development of their services, and, although some studies in the systematic review included patients' perspectives, these were not reported consistently. Few of the included studies described the socioeconomic status of participants, the numbers of patients from ethnic minorities or the digital literacy of patients; however, services in practice acknowledged frustrations in relation to intersecting inequalities experienced by their patients. Although services have been developing digital and remote delivery options throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, newer digital delivery of interventions has not yet had time to feed through to clinical trials. Neither data set took priority in the synthesis of findings.

Recommendations for future research

We recommend that additional research actively engages with patients and their experiences of physical activity promotion and perioperative physical activity programmes. We would encourage further study of the tentative values and principles outlined in this report and their utility and adoption in the shaping and development of perioperative physical activity programmes. We also suggest that inequalities in provision related to socioeconomic disadvantages, digital access and ethnicity should be explored. Future randomised controlled trials should include, or even prioritise, outcomes that reflect the wider range of possible benefits associated with physical activity programmes (e.g. greater feelings of control and autonomy among participants). Standardised measures for research and/or service evaluation in this field should be developed and tested.

Conclusion

The research evidence base for interventions delivered in the perioperative setting, aimed at enhancing physical activity among patients in the medium to longer term, suggests some overall benefit in terms of engagement, levels of activity, physical fitness and quality of life. Our contextual enquiry complements the research literature and indicates that interventions should be focused around the individual, delivered by compassionate staff in local communities and promoted by patients' full clinical teams.

Study registration

This study is registered as PROSPERO CRD42019139008.

Funding

This project was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Health and Social Care Delivery Research programme and will be published in full in *Health and Social Care Delivery Research*; Vol. 10, No. 21. See the NIHR Journals Library website for further project information.

Health and Social Care Delivery Research

ISSN 2755-0060 (Print)

ISSN 2755-0079 (Online)

Health and Social Care Delivery Research (HSDR) was launched in 2013 and is indexed by Europe PMC, DOAJ, INAHTA, Ulrichsweb and NCBI Bookshelf.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

This journal was previously published as *Health Services and Delivery Research* (Volumes 1–9); ISSN 2050-4349 (print), ISSN 2050-4357 (online)

The full HSDR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hcdr. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health and Social Care Delivery Research* journal

Reports are published in *Health and Social Care Delivery Research* (HSDR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HSDR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

HSDR programme

The HSDR programme funds research to produce evidence to impact on the quality, accessibility and organisation of health and social care services. This includes evaluations of how the NHS and social care might improve delivery of services.

For more information about the HSDR programme please visit the website at <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/explore-nihr/funding-programmes/health-and-social-care-delivery-research.htm>

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HSDR programme or one of its preceding programmes as project number NIHR127879. The contractual start date was in September 2019. The final report began editorial review in May 2021 and was accepted for publication in February 2022. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HSDR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HSDR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HSDR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Copyright © 2022 Pritchard *et al.* This work was produced by Pritchard *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Professor of Digital Health Care, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HSDR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HSDR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Consultant in Public Health, Delta Public Health Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Interim Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board. Consultant Advisor, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Senior Adviser, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Reader in Trials, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Emeritus Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Consultant Advisor, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Palliative Care and Paediatrics Unit, Population Policy and Practice Programme, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk