

# LEUVEN



# Can aquatic exercise improve function in elderly persons with and without chronic disability?: A systematic review

Daniel Daly, Gabriele Vanlanthen, Tine Vanhullebusch & Johan Lambeck K.U.Leuven, Belgium



- Balneotherapy and spa therapy are common treatments for low back pain.
  - The costs are sometimes reimbursed.
- A systematic review found only 5 RCTs. Judged by self reported pain on a visual analogue scale, the treatments were modestly effective (Rheumatology 2006;45: 880-4).

## The Problem



A more important finding is the mismatch between the popularity of these interventions and the paucity of evaluations of their efficacy.

(BMJ, 2006)

# Purpose



Exercise is beneficial for elderly and water is an appropriate environment to exercise, nevertheless no recent review has concentrated on this population and the evidence remains unclear.

Systematically review the literature on the effect of aquatic exercise on function, activity and participation in elderly with and without chronic diseases.

## Methods



Studies: randomised controlled trials.

Population: mean age 55 yrs or older, independent in ADL-and with or without chronic disability.

Interventions: active aquatic therapy (exercise not SPA).

Outcomes: Cardiovascular fitness, flexibility, balance, strength and body composition.

## Search: PUBMED, PEDRO, CINAHL, Sports Discu Cochrane controlled trials register



KATHOLEKE UNIVERSITEIT

**Search Terms:** Aquatic therapy and

d Fitness

and

Elderly

or

Aquatic exercise

Balance/Fall prevention

Water therapy

Quality of life

Hydrotherapy

Aquatic Physiotherapy

Water exercise

Aquatic Rehabilitation

Pool exercise

Water rehab

Limits:

Human

Adult (age≥55)

Published 1980-01/2008

RCT's, Reviews

## Search results: 2 Reviewers



Potential relevant studies (N=114)

N=84 excluded after reading abstract

- passive intervention in water
  - average age ≤ 55 years
  - review/no RCT

N = 30

N=19

N=11 excluded after reading article

- written in Japanese
- not yet published
- did not meet inclusion criteria
- no control group

#### Results



9 studies = Healthy population

1 study = Stroke

4 studies = Arthritis

2 studies = Rheumatism

1 study = Oosteoporosis

1 study = Heart Disease

1 study = COPD





study	N		Body Function / Structure
Takeshima & al. 2000	30	healthy	VO2 peak, FEV1,trunkROM,muscleF, skinfold
Cider & al. 2003	25	chronic heart failure	VO2max/peak
Chu & al. 2004	12	chronic stroke (mild - moderate)	VO2max, max workload, paretic muscle F
Devereux & al. 2005	50	osteopenia - osteoporosis	Ø
Wang & al. 2006	38	osteoarthritis hip or knee	ROM lower limb(exept knee flexion), Muscle F lowerlimb
Eversden & al. 2007	115	rheumatoid arthritis	Ø
Hinman & al 2007	71	hip/knee osteoarthritis	Visual Analogue Scale, WOMAC pain & function
Sato & al. 2007	30	frail elderly persons	Ø
Foley & al. 2008	105	hip/knee osteoarthritis	QuadricepsF: GYM > HYDRO
Silva & al. 2008	64	knee osteoarthritis	Visual Analogue Scale: Decrease PAIN GYM <hydro 50="" after="" feet="" test<="" th="" walk=""></hydro>



study	N		Activity / Participation			
Takeshima & al. 2000	30	healthy	Vertical jump, Side step test			
Cider & al. 2003	25	chronic heart failure	6 min walk test			
Chu & al. 2004	12	chronic stroke (mild - moderate)	Gait speed			
Devereux & al. 2005	50	osteopenia - osteoporosis	Step test, SF36			
Wang & al. 2006	38	osteoarthritis hip or knee	6 min walk test			
Eversden & al. 2007	115	rheumatoid arthritis	10 m walk time			
Hinman & al 2007	71	hip/knee osteoarthritis	6 min walk test			
Sato & al. 2007	30	frail elderly persons	SF36 physical & mental component, HQRoL, FIM for both group after 6 months			
Foley & al. 2008	105	hip/knee osteoarthritis	6 min walk test: HYDRO > CONTROL GYM = CONTROL			
Silva & al. 2008	64	knee osteoarthritis	Ø			

EWAC MEDICAL

# Delphi score: Methodolgical quality of selected studies We get you moving

_							_								_	1	c yo		,	
	Chu 2004	Eversden 2007	Foley 2003	Hinman 2007	Silva 2008	Devereux 2005	Hall 1996	lde 2005	Tsourlou 2006	Sato 2007	Takeshima 2002	Taunton 1996	Simmons 1996	Wang 2006	Broman 2006	Lord 2006	Wadell 2004	Cider 2003	Douris 2003	
Randomisation?	х	Х	X	Х	X	х	Х	X	X	Х	X	X	X	X	X	0	?	0	0	
Concealed allocation?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	0	
Equal at baseline?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	
Eligibility specified?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Blind accessors?	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	?	X	0	X	X	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	
Blind care providers?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	
Blinded participants?	X	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	X	0	
Point estimates and variability?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Intention-to-treat?	?	X	X	X	X	X	?	?	?	?	?	?	X	X	?	X	X	0	0	
Delphi score	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	2	

- Samples = 12 to 139 persons (M = 106.5, groups = 7-35)
- M age from 58 to 78 years.
- Intervention = 4 to 24 weeks
- 1 to 3 sessions a week
- Total treatment = 240 to 4320 min, (M=1460 min).
- Water level from waist to chest level.
- Water temperature between 25° and 35° C.
- Less than 50% did a follow-up study

# Results: Meta analysis



	experimental control							Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Broman 2006	1.92	0.28	15	1.72	0.27	9	42.3%	0.70 [-0.16, 1.55]	<del>                                     </del>
Takeshima 2002	1.31	0.34	15	1.14	0.25	15	57.7%	0.55 [-0.18, 1.29]	+-
Total (95% CI)			30			24	100.0%	0.62 [0.06, 1.17]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi²=	0.06, df	<del></del>							
Test for overall effect:	Z= 2.17	(P = 0	.03)						favours control favours experiment

#### **Aerobic Capacity**

	Expe	Experimental Control						Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subg	roup Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Hinman 2007	441.72	87.25	36	440.38	79.03	35	59.2%	0.02 [-0.45, 0.48]	<del>-</del>
Wang 2006	388.4	80.3	38	390.7	88.6	18	40.8%	-0.03 [-0.59, 0.53]	_
Total (95% CI)			74			53	100.0%	-0.00 [-0.36, 0.36]	•
Heterogeneity:	$Chi^2 = 0.01, df =$	1 (P = I	0.91); l <sup>a</sup>	= 0%				<del></del>	
Test for overal	effect: Z = 0.01	(P = 0.9	9)					Fa	avours experimental Favours control

6 min. Walk

- <u>Aerobic Capacity</u>: improves (does not decrease) if exercise is specific and intervention long enough (12% - 22%)
- For ROM the evidence less consistent (+11%)
- Balance: Only with specific exercises
- Strength: (5% to 30%)
- Body composition: (3.4% increase in lean body mass and 8% decrease in skin-fold thickness).
  - Only 1 study reported an adverse effect of aquatic therapy.

- An aquatic exercise program is moderately to highly effective in elderly for improvement of: body functions and structures, activitie and participation.
- There is a need for more high quality trials with sufficient sample size, blinded outcome assessment and follow-up assessment
- Aquatic exercise guidelines need to be developed







study	N	population	aquatic intervention	control group activity	follow- up
Takeshima & al. 2000	30	healthy	intervention clearly explained 70 min, 3x/week, 12 weeks	normal daily a We get you mou	ring N #
Cider & al. 2003	25	chronic heart failure	intervention clearly explained 45 min, 3x/week, 8 weeks	normal daily activity, no PA changes	N
Chu & al. 2004	12	chronic stroke (mild - moderate)	intervention clearly explained 60 min, 3x/week, 8 weeks	arm function program	N
Devereux & al. 2005	50	osteopenia - osteoporosis	intervention moderately explained 60 min, 2x/week,10 weeks	no instructions not encouraged to change daily living	N
Wang & al. 2006	38	osteoarthritis hip or knee	intervention clearly explained 50 min, 3x/week,12 weeks	normal daily activity, hydrotherapy end of the trail	N
Eversden & al. 2007	115	rheumatoid arthritis	intervention moderately explained 30min, 1x/week, 6 weeks	same rpogram on land	Y ( after 12 weeks)
Fransen & al. 2007	152	hip/knee osteoarthritis	interventions clearly explained 60 min, 2x/week, 12 weeks	T'ai Chi: 24 form	Y (after 12
Hinman & al 2007	71	hip/knee osteoarthritis	intervention clearly explained 45 - 60 min, 2x/week, 6weeks	control: waiting list normal daily activity, no medication changes	weeks) Y (after 6 weeks)
Sato & al. 2007	30	frail elderly persons	60 min, 1x/week, 24 weeks intervention clearly explained	normal daily activity	N
Foley & al.	105	hip/knee	intervention poorly explained	control:normal daily activity	Y
2008	, 00	osteoarthritis	30 min, 3x/week, 6 weeks	gym: program with fitness equipment	(not clear)
Silva & al. 2008	64	knee osteoarthritis	intervention moderately explained 50 min,3x/week, 18 weeks	similar land-based exercises	Y ( after 18 weeks)