

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Soukkio, Paula K.; Suikkanen, Sara A.; Aartolahti, Eeva M.; Kautiainen, Hannu; Kääriä, Sanna M.; Hupli, Markku T.; Pitkälä, Kaisu H.; Sipilä, Sarianna; Kukkonen-Harjula, Katriina T.

**Title:** Effects of home-based physical exercise on days at home, healthcare utilization and functional independence among patients with hip fractures : a randomized controlled trial

**Year:** 2021

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © 2021 The American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine

**Rights:** CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

**Rights url:** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

**Please cite the original version:**

Soukkio, P. K., Suikkanen, S. A., Aartolahti, E. M., Kautiainen, H., Kääriä, S. M., Hupli, M. T., Pitkälä, K. H., Sipilä, S., & Kukkonen-Harjula, K. T. (2021). Effects of home-based physical exercise on days at home, healthcare utilization and functional independence among patients with hip fractures : a randomized controlled trial. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 102(9), 1692-1699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2021.04.004>

1 **Running head:** Home-based exercise after hip fracture

2

3 **Effects of home-based physical exercise on days at home, healthcare utilization and functional**  
4 **independence among patients with hip fractures: a randomized controlled trial**

5

6 Paula K. Soukkio<sup>1,2</sup>, MSc, Sara A. Suikkanen<sup>1,2</sup>, MSc, Eeva M. Aartolahti<sup>2</sup>, PhD, Hannu Kautiainen<sup>4</sup>,  
7 BA, Sanna M. Kääriä<sup>3</sup>, PhD, Markku T. Hupli<sup>1</sup>, MD, PhD, Kaisu H. Pitkälä<sup>4</sup>, MD, PhD, Sarianna  
8 Sipilä<sup>2,5</sup>, PhD, Katriina T. Kukkonen-Harjula<sup>1</sup>, MD, PhD

9

10 <sup>1</sup>Rehabilitation, South Karelia Social and Health Care District (Eksote), Valto Käkelän katu 3, FI-  
11 53130 Lappeenranta, Finland, <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, PO  
12 Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland, <sup>3</sup>Raatimiehet Oy, Raatimiehenkatu 18, FI-53100,  
13 Lappeenranta, Finland, <sup>4</sup>Unit of Primary Health Care, University of Helsinki, Department of  
14 General Practice, and Helsinki University Hospital, Tukholmankatu 8 B, FI-00290 Helsinki, Finland,  
15 <sup>5</sup>Gerontology Research Center, Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä,  
16 Rautpohjankatu 8, FI-40700 Jyväskylä, Finland

17

18 The study was performed in South Karelia Social and Health Care District (Eksote), Lappeenranta,  
19 Finland.

20

21 Acknowledgments: We thank Ms. Kaija Paajanen, registered nurse, and Ms. Virpi Äärimaa,  
22 practical nurse, for their contribution in participant recruitment and data acquisition. We also  
23 thank the personnel of South Karelia Social and Health Care District for their help in recruitment.

24

25 Congress presentations: Baseline characteristics of the participants were presented as a poster in  
26 the 24<sup>th</sup> Nordic Congress of Gerontology in Oslo, Norway, on May 2–4, 2018, and in the  
27 International Association of Geriatrics and Gerontology – European Region Congress in  
28 Gothenburg, Sweden, on May 23–25, 2019.

29

30 Financial support: This study was funded by South Karelia Social and Health Care District (Eksote,  
31 grant number 1236/00.01.05.01/2013), the Social Insurance Institution of Finland (SII, grant  
32 numbers 94/331/2013, and 17/26/2019), and State Research Funding for Academic Health  
33 Research (Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland, grant numbers HUS 2016,  
34 HUS/2931/2017, HUS/2571/2017, and HUS/2631/2019). The funders had no role in the design,  
35 collection, analyses, or interpretation of the data, nor in writing the manuscript or in the decision  
36 to submit the article for publication.

37

38 Conflicts of interest: None

39

40 Corresponding author: Paula Soukkio, MSc, Rehabilitation, South Karelia Social and Health Care  
41 District, Lappeenranta, Finland

42 Postal address: Valto Käkelän katu 14 D, FI-53130, Lappeenranta, Finland

43 Phone: +358 40 651 3969

44 E-mail: paula.soukkio@eksote.fi

45

46 Clinical Trial registration number: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02305433

47

48 Reprints are not available.

49 **ABSTRACT**

50

51 **Objective** To evaluate the effects of a physical exercise program on days lived at home, the use  
52 and costs of healthcare and social services mortality and functional independence among patients  
53 with hip fractures.

54

55 **Design** Randomized controlled trial with parallel two-group design, consisting of a 12-month  
56 intervention and 12-month registry follow-up.

57

58 **Setting** Home-based intervention.

59

60 **Participants** Patients with operated hip fracture, living at home, aged  $\geq 60$  years, randomized into  
61 physical-exercise (n=61) or usual-care (n=60) groups.

62

63 **Intervention** Supervised physical exercise twice a week.

64

65 **Main Outcome Measures** The primary outcome was the number of days lived at home over 24  
66 months. Secondary outcomes were the use and costs of healthcare and social services and  
67 mortality over 24 months, and Functional Independence Measure (FIM) over 12 months.

68

69 **Results** Over 24 months there was no significant difference between the groups in terms of days  
70 lived at home (Incidence Rate Ratio [IRR] 1.01 [95% CI 0.90–1.14]) or mortality (Hazard Ratio [HR]  
71 1.01 [95% CI 0.42–2.43]). The mean total costs of healthcare and social services did not differ  
72 between the groups: over 12 months the costs per person-year were 1.26-fold (95% CI 0.87–1.86)

73 and over 24 months 1.08-fold (95% CI 0.77–1.70) greater in the physical-exercise than in the usual-  
74 care group. The mean difference between the change in FIM of the groups over 12 months was  
75 4.5 points (95% CI 0.5–8.5,  $p=0.029$ ) in favor of the physical-exercise group.

76

77 **Conclusions** Long-term home-based physical exercise had no effect on the number of days lived at  
78 home over 24 months among patients with hip fractures. The intervention was cost neutral over  
79 these 24 months. The FIM scores improved in both groups over 12 months, but significantly more  
80 in the physical-exercise group than in the usual-care group.

81

82 **Key Words:** Hip Fractures, Exercise, Rehabilitation, Aged, Functional Status, Health Services, Cost  
83 Analysis

84

85 **List of Abbreviations:** ADL (Activities of Daily Living), IADL (Instrumental Activities of Daily Living),  
86 FIM (Functional Independence Measure), HR (Hazard Ratio), ICD (International Statistical  
87 Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems), IRR (Incidence Rate Ratio), MMSE (Mini-  
88 Mental State Examination), NYHA (New York Heart Association), RR (Risk Ratio)

89

90 Hip fractures diminish older peoples' functional capacity,<sup>1-3</sup> health and quality-of-life,<sup>4, 5</sup> and  
91 increase the risk of mortality.<sup>6-8</sup> They pose an economic burden on societies<sup>9, 10</sup> by increasing the  
92 use and costs of healthcare and social services,<sup>11-13</sup> especially nursing home (24-hour) care.<sup>3, 14, 15</sup>  
93 Increased service use is due to patients' poor pre-fracture functioning<sup>13, 16</sup> and poor recovery of  
94 functional capacity after a hip fracture.<sup>1-3</sup> Multicomponent, individual, progressive, supervised and  
95 long-term exercise interventions after hospital discharge have prevented the loss of functional  
96 capacity of patients with hip fractures.<sup>17-24</sup> However, there is no consensus on optimal exercise  
97 content or duration,<sup>19, 25</sup> or the best settings for exercise regimens.<sup>17, 26</sup>

98  
99 Evidence on the effects of long-term, supervised home-based physical exercise on days lived at  
100 home among patients with hip fractures is lacking. Previous studies have mainly focused on the  
101 effects of outpatient exercise programs on nursing home admissions<sup>18</sup>, re-hospitalization<sup>27</sup> and  
102 overall healthcare costs<sup>28</sup>. Regarding healthcare and social service utilization, home-based exercise  
103 regimens with relatively short intervention periods and with a few supervised exercise sessions  
104 have shown to be cost-neutral<sup>29</sup> and probably cost-effective<sup>30</sup>. Further investigations are needed  
105 to clarify whether home-based exercise interventions could increase the number of days at home  
106 among patients with hip fractures and also be cost-effective.

107  
108 The aim of this randomized controlled trial was to study the effects of a year-long home-based  
109 physical-exercise program among patients with operated hip fractures on the number of days lived  
110 at home over 24 months. In addition, we evaluated the effects of the exercise program on the use  
111 and costs of healthcare and social services and on mortality over 24 months, and on functional  
112 independence over 12 months.

113

114

**115 METHODS**

116

**117 Study design**

118

119

120 This parallel-group, randomized controlled trial with physical-exercise and usual-care arms was  
121 conducted in accordance with the Helsinki declaration in one social and healthcare district (133  
122 000 inhabitants) in Finland between 12/2014 and 12/2019. The study protocol has been reported  
123 earlier.<sup>31</sup> The study received ethical approval from the relevant ethics committee in Finland in  
124 November 2014 and was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov in December 2014.

125

**126 Participants**

127

128

129 Between 10/2014 and 12/2017, 541 patients with hip fractures were operated on at the district's  
130 main hospital, from which they moved primarily to the adjacent rehabilitation hospital, or in some  
131 cases to primary care hospital wards or straight home. Overall, we contacted 338 patients at the  
132 rehabilitation hospital for whom discharge was planned. Of these, 144 were interested and  
133 granted their permission for our home visit after discharge to assess their eligibility. Of these, 121  
134 were eligible and willing to participate, and signed an informed consent document (Figure 1). The  
135 main inclusion criteria were: age of 60 or over, living at home, being able to walk indoors (walking  
136 aid allowed), a Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE)<sup>32</sup> score of  $\geq 12$ , first-operated femoral-neck  
137 (ICD code S72.0), pertrochanteric (S72.1) or subtrochanteric (S72.2) fracture of the femur, and no

138 contraindications as regards physical exercise (e.g. Class III or IV of NYHA [New York Heart  
139 Association Functional Classification] or severe neurological disease). Exclusion criteria were living  
140 in a nursing home or life expectancy of <2 years. The original inclusion criteria of age ( $\geq 65$  years),  
141 and MMSE ( $\geq 17$ ) were lowered in April 2015, in order to increase the number of eligible  
142 participants because recruitment rates were low.

143

144 After baseline assessments, the participants were randomized into a physical-exercise group  
145 (n=61) or a usual-care control group (n=60), using a computer-generated random sequence  
146 allocation program with randomly varying block sizes of two to ten without stratification. The  
147 program was generated by a statistician who had no other role in the trial. The project manager of  
148 the trial used the randomization program and informed the participants of the randomization  
149 result.

150

## 151 **Outcomes**

152

153

154 The main outcome was the number of days lived at home over 24 months (730 days). Days in  
155 hospital wards, long-term wards, nursing homes, and days after death up to the end of the 24-  
156 month follow-up were counted as days not lived at home. The information on all the randomized  
157 participants was gathered from the electronic medical records of the social and healthcare district  
158 by a business intelligence analyst blinded to allocation.

159

160 We report three secondary outcomes (healthcare and social service utilization, mortality and  
161 functional independence) of our trial in this article. Information on all the randomized



162 participant's healthcare and social service utilization and mortality over 24-months was acquired  
163 from medical records. All contacts between the participants and primary care, specialized medical  
164 care and home-care, as well as days in hospitals and nursing homes, and the physical exercise  
165 sessions of our intervention were included in the analyses. Costs (in euros) were calculated from  
166 the social and healthcare provider's perspective, by multiplying the number of service units used  
167 by national mean unit costs in 2011,<sup>33</sup> and correcting them to the 2018 level according to the  
168 inflation rate based on the cost-of-living index. Pharmaceutical costs incurred outside the hospital  
169 were not included. The cost of one physical exercise session in the patients' homes varied from 60  
170 to 130 euros (€) and included the physiotherapist's travel expenses. The mean cost of the  
171 intervention was calculated by multiplying the mean cost of one session (86.50€) by the number of  
172 completed sessions. The used services and their costs were calculated per person-year.

173

174 Functional independence was assessed using the Functional Independence Measure (FIM), which  
175 includes motor and cognitive components.<sup>34</sup> During the assessment visits to the participant's homes  
176 at baseline, and at three, six and 12 months, the study physiotherapist or the study nurse, not  
177 blinded to the allocation, interviewed and observed the participant and evaluated 18 tasks using  
178 scores from 1 (total assistance) to 7 (complete independence).

179

180 Background information on age, sex, and living arrangements were acquired through interviews,  
181 and information on illnesses and medications, and the details of the hip-fracture surgery were  
182 drawn from medical records. Data on participation in and the adverse effects of the intervention  
183 were acquired from the physiotherapists' monthly reports.

184

185 **Physical exercise intervention**

186

187

188 Our 12-month supervised, structured, and progressive physical exercise program was executed as  
189 one-hour sessions twice a week at the participant's home, starting approximately within two  
190 weeks of discharge from the rehabilitation hospital.<sup>31</sup> The intervention contained strength,  
191 balance, mobility and functional exercises, counselling on physical activity, and brief advice on  
192 nutrition. Exercises were individually tailored according to the participant's health status and  
193 goals, and their intensity was increased gradually to ensure progression. If acute illnesses or  
194 hospitalization led to temporary suspension of the intervention, the program continued after  
195 recovery. The participants in the physical-exercise group could also use any necessary healthcare  
196 or social services, including rehabilitation, over the 24-month study period. A detailed description  
197 of the intervention has been presented earlier.<sup>31</sup>

198

### 199 **Usual care**

200

201

202 The participants in the usual-care group received no exercise intervention. In accordance with the  
203 local guideline on hip fractures, the need for home-based rehabilitation was evaluated at the time  
204 of discharge from the rehabilitation hospital. Patients were either instructed to continue exercises  
205 by themselves, or received short-term, supervised home-based rehabilitation. Over 24 months,  
206 the participants in the usual-care group could use any healthcare or social services they needed.

207

### 208 **Statistical analyses**

209

210

211 Power calculations were based on data from the PERFECT study,<sup>35</sup> from which data on the  
212 proportion of patients living at home one year after the hip fracture were available. A sample size  
213 of 182 (91 per research arm) persons was needed to detect the hypothesized difference ( $\alpha=0.05$ ,  
214 power=80%) of 180 (SD 431) days in the days lived at home over 24 months of the physical-  
215 exercise and usual-care arms. To allow for discontinuation (15%) and death (20%), our target was  
216 300 participants.

217

218 The baseline characteristics of the participants in the randomization groups are reported as means  
219 with SDs or as frequencies with percentages. The groups were compared using the t-test or  
220 bootstrap type t-test, for continuous variables, and Pearson's chi-square test or Fisher's exact test  
221 for categorical variables.

222

223 The main outcome, the number of days lived at home over 24 months, and the amount of use of  
224 healthcare and social services (secondary outcome; visits or days) were analyzed using a  
225 generalized linear model with appropriate distribution (Poisson or binomial) and log-link  
226 function. The results are reported as days or visits, and incidence rate ratios (IRR) or risk ratios (RR)  
227 with 95% confidence intervals (CIs based on a Poisson distribution). Poisson regression is similar to  
228 multivariate regression (OLS), in which the number of days and visits is followed using the Poisson  
229 distribution and observed as a dependent (count data) variable.<sup>37</sup>

230

231 Cost analyses were performed using a generalized linear regression model with log-link and  
232 gamma-variance functions. The variance function was selected on the basis of the Park test and  
233 Akaike's information criterion. The bootstrapping (bias-corrected) technique was used in

234 connection with the cost analyses (1000 replicates). Changes in FIM scores and differences  
235 between the changes in the groups at three, six and 12 months were analyzed using mixed-effects  
236 models, with an unstructured covariance matrix (Kenward–Roger method to calculate degrees of  
237 freedom). The repeated measurements were taken at different time points, including baseline,  
238 three, six and 12 months. Mixed models enabled analyses of unbalanced datasets without  
239 imputation; therefore, we analyzed all the available data with the full analysis set. Differences in  
240 costs per person-year in relation to baseline FIM scores were analyzed using a four-knot restricted  
241 cubic spline generalized linear regression model with log-link and gamma-variance functions. We  
242 used the Kaplan–Meier method to estimate cumulative mortality using asymptotic variance  
243 confidence intervals. Regarding mortality, we also used the Cox proportional hazards model to  
244 calculate adjusted hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% CIs. The normality of the variables was evaluated  
245 graphically and using the Shapiro–Wilk *W* test. The analyses were adjusted for sex and age and  
246 carried out according to the intention-to-treat principle. Statistical analyses were performed using  
247 the Stata 16.1, StataCorp LP (College Station, TX, USA) statistical package.

248

249

## 250 **RESULTS**

251

252

253 At baseline, the participants' mean age was 81.5 and 75% were female. The participants in the  
254 physical-exercise group were slightly older than those in the usual-care group (83 [SD 6] years vs.  
255 80 [SD 7] years, and there were slightly more female participants in the physical-exercise group  
256 than in the usual-care group (82% vs. 68%), respectively (Table 1). Sixty percent of all the  
257 participants lived alone, and 48% received home-care services.

258

259 The mean participation rate of the exercise sessions was 82% (mean number of sessions 85,  
260 median 96, range 1–104) per participant. No serious adverse effects were observed during the  
261 sessions. Seventy-four percent of the participants reported mild transient musculoskeletal  
262 problems, of which 24% were related to known illnesses, such as osteoarthritis. Shortness of  
263 breath was reported by 41%, and six people experienced a fall during exercise but had no need for  
264 medical care.

265

### 266 **Main Outcome**

267

268

269 The main outcome, the mean number of days lived at home over 24 months, was 625 days (95% CI  
270 578–673) in the physical-exercise group and 616 (95% CI 563–670) in the usual-care group (age-  
271 and sex-adjusted IRR 1.01 [95% CI 0.90–1.14]). Twenty-eight people (46%) in the physical-exercise  
272 group and 18 people (30%) in the usual-care group lived at home for the full 730 days (age- and  
273 sex-adjusted RR 1.53 [95% CI 0.94–2.48],  $p=0.088$ ).

274

275 Two people (3%) in the physical-exercise group and three people (5%) in the usual-care group  
276 were permanently placed in nursing homes ( $p=0.69$ ) during the 24-month period. Five people in  
277 the physical-exercise group and six in the usual-care group died over the initial 12-month period,  
278 and six and four persons over the next 12 months, respectively (Figure 1). Two-year survival in the  
279 physical-exercise group was 82% (95% CI 70–90%) and in the usual-care group 83% (95% CI 71–  
280 91%); age- and sex-adjusted HR 1.01 (95% CI 0.42–2.43).

281

## 282 **Secondary outcomes**

283

284

285 The mean total costs of all healthcare and social services per person-year over 12 months were  
286 1.26-fold (95% CI 0.87–1.86) greater in the physical-exercise group (40 722 € [SE 3942]) than in the  
287 usual-care group (33 180 € [SE 5808]). Over 24 months, in the physical-exercise group, the mean  
288 total costs per person-year (34 159 € [SE 3857]) were 1.08-fold (95% CI 0.77–1.70) greater than in  
289 the usual-care group (31 848 € [SE 5663]) (Table 2).

290

291 The mean change of total FIM scores over 12 months was 6.0 (95% CI 3.3–8.8) points in the  
292 physical-exercise group and 1.6 (95% CI -1.2–4.4) points in the usual-care group (Figure 2). The  
293 sex- and age-adjusted mean difference between the changes of total FIM scores of the groups was  
294 4.5 points (95% CI 0.5–8.5,  $p=0.029$ ). Among the participants in the physical-exercise group who  
295 had baseline FIM scores above 100, the total costs of healthcare and social services per person-  
296 year over 24 months were 9000 € higher than among those with a baseline FIM score of  $>100$  in  
297 the usual-care group (Figure 3).

298

299

## 300 **DISCUSSION**

301

302

303 This randomized controlled trial of a year-long, supervised, home-based physical-exercise program  
304 for patients with hip fractures revealed no significant differences in the number of days lived at  
305 home or in mortality over 24 months between the physical-exercise and usual-care groups.

306 However, functional independence improved more in the physical-exercise group than in the  
307 usual-care group over the 12-month training period. This improvement was gained cost-neutrally  
308 in terms of all the healthcare and social services used.

309

310 Days lived at home after operated hip fracture has not been a specified outcome in previous  
311 home-based exercise studies, but rehabilitation has been reported to have effects on hip-fracture  
312 patients' nursing home admittance and mortality. Of our participants, 46% in the physical-exercise  
313 group, and 30% in the usual-care group lived at home for the full 24 months without any  
314 intermittent inpatient care, while 3% and 5% were permanently admitted to nursing-homes, and  
315 18% and 17% died, respectively. The low rate of nursing home admittance in our trial could be the  
316 result of recent policies that favor home-based services in Finland and in other European  
317 countries.<sup>38, 39</sup> In contrast to our result, another supervised progressive outpatient resistance-  
318 training and multidisciplinary intervention program reduced the odds of requiring admittance to a  
319 nursing home and the risk of mortality over 12 months in comparison to standard care.

320

321 In our trial, the mean use and costs of all healthcare and social services per person-year of the  
322 physical-exercise and the usual-care groups did not differ over 12 or 24 months. A meta-analysis  
323 found no effects of home-based rehabilitation on emergency department visits,<sup>24</sup> and 10-week  
324 multidisciplinary home rehabilitation did not reduce hospital days<sup>40</sup> over 12 months after a hip  
325 fracture. Furthermore, another study with a 12-month home-based exercise program showed no  
326 effects on service use or costs after hospital discharge among older adults with falls or joint  
327 replacement procedures.<sup>41</sup>

328

329 According to our analyses, long-term and progressive home-based exercise programs should focus  
330 on patients with hip fractures who have total FIM scores under 100 at the time of discharge.  
331 Among these, the costs of rehabilitation were more likely to be balanced by reduced utilization of  
332 other healthcare and social services. Rehabilitation (including the physical-exercise intervention)  
333 was the main reason for the higher costs in the physical-exercise group than those in the usual-  
334 care group over 24 months. Future trials should concentrate on finding new ways to implement  
335 home-based rehabilitation; for example, using remote technologies or implementing more  
336 exercise training in a more systematic way in home-care services to enhance functional  
337 independence and reduce overall rehabilitation costs.

338

339 In our trial, functional independence improved more in the physical-exercise group than in the  
340 usual-care group over 12 months. This improvement in FIM was gained cost neutrally in terms of  
341 all the healthcare and social services used. The 4.5-point mean difference between the changes in  
342 total FIM scores of the groups indicates less need for assistance in daily activities and might be  
343 considered clinically meaningful.<sup>42</sup> To our knowledge, our trial is the first to report on the effects  
344 of home-based rehabilitation on FIM scores among patients with hip fractures. Previous studies  
345 have reported contradictory results for ADL (activities of daily living)<sup>21,43</sup> or IADL (instrumental  
346 activities of daily living)<sup>21</sup>. Edgren et al. (2015)<sup>21</sup> found that a 12-month home-based physical-  
347 exercise program may reduce disability, but Orwig et al. (2011)<sup>43</sup> found no effect on physical  
348 functioning among people with hip fractures.

349

350 A rigorous randomized design, successful randomization (except for age and sex, which were  
351 taken into account in the analyses), and a relatively small loss to follow-up are strengths of our  
352 trial. The information on days lived at home and on all use of healthcare and social services was



353 complete as it was gathered from electronic medical records, and the use of private healthcare  
354 and social services was rare. Furthermore, adherence to our supervised intervention was good,  
355 and no serious adverse events occurred. Supervision enables more individualized and safer  
356 training.<sup>44</sup>

357

### 358 **Study Limitations**

359

360

361 The first limitation is the size of recruited sample (n=121) which is below the power calculations  
362 (n=182), as many patients refused to participate due to poor perceived health. Widening the two  
363 inclusion criteria (age and MMSE) had no effect on the recruitment rate. Our study could have  
364 been underpowered for detecting a 180-day difference between the groups in terms of their days  
365 lived at home, as used in the power analysis. Secondly, the hypothesized difference between the  
366 groups in our study's main outcome may have been overestimated. Thirdly, the FIM assessments  
367 involve a risk of bias because the assessors were not blinded to the allocation result. Finally, we  
368 were unable to study the effects of our intervention on FIM over 24 months, as we had data  
369 planned the assessments to cover a 12-month period.

370

371

### 372 **CONCLUSION**

373

374

375 Our 12-month, physiotherapist-supervised, home-based physical exercise trial had no effect on  
376 the number of days lived at home or on mortality over 24 months among patients with hip

377 fractures. The intervention was cost neutral, and there was no difference between the groups'  
378 total public healthcare and social service costs over 12 or over 24 months. Our intervention  
379 improved functional independence to a greater extent in the physical-exercise group than in the  
380 usual-care group over 12 months.

381

382 Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the participants in the physical-exercise and usual-care groups.

383 Frequencies (%) or means (SD) are shown.

Characteristics	Physical-exercise n=61	Usual-care n=60
Age, mean (SD)	83 (6)	80 (7)
Women, n (%)	50 (82)	41 (68)
Education <9 years, n (%)	38 (62)	39 (65)
Living, n (%)		
Alone	37 (61)	35 (58)
With spouse	16 (26)	19 (32)
With another person	8 (13)	6 (10)
Home-care services, n (%)		
0 times/week	28 (46)	35 (58)
1–7 times/week	13 (21)	13 (22)
>7 times/week	20 (33)	12 (20)
Number of regular medications, mean (SD)	8.8 (3.4)	8.7 (3.0)
Physician-diagnosed diseases or disorders, n (%)		
Coronary heart disease	27 (44)	27 (45)
Stroke or Transient Ischemic Attack (TIA)	14 (23)	19 (32)
Hypertension	44 (72)	43 (72)
Diabetes	16 (26)	12 (20)
Osteoporosis	27 (44)	24 (40)
Alzheimer's disease	11 (18)	10 (17)

Body Mass Index (BMI) (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), mean (SD)	26.4 (4.4)	25.9 (4.4)	384
MMSE, mean (SD)	23.1 (4.7)	22.7 (4.2)	385
Fracture type (ICD code), n (%)			386
Femoral-neck (S72.0)	39 (64)	35 (58)	387
Petrochanteric (S72.1)	17 (28)	21 (35)	388
Subtrochanteric (S72.2)	5 (8)	4 (7)	389
Type of surgery (NOMESCO* codes) <sup>36</sup>			391
Total hip arthroplasty <sup>†</sup>	2 (3)	0 (0)	392
Hemiarthroplasty <sup>‡</sup>	31 (52)	36 (59)	393
Internal fixation <sup>§</sup>	27 (45)	25 (41)	394
Hospital care, days, mean (SD)			395
From the fracture event to surgery	1.4 (1.5)	1.1 (1.4)	396
Stay in the surgical ward	4.9 (2.5)	4.7 (2.6)	397
Stay in the rehabilitation hospital	23.2 (12.4)	25.3 (16.5)	398
From hospital admission to discharge	28.1 (12.1)	30.0 (17.1)	399
FIM, mean (SD)			400
Total	97.2 (13.1)	98.0 (15.0)	401
Motor	67.4 (10.3)	68.1 (11.2)	402
Cognition	29.6 (4.2)	29.1 (5.0)	403
			404

409 \* NOMESCO (Nordic Medico-Statistical Committee Classification of Surgical Procedures)<sup>36</sup>

410 † including hybrid total hip arthroplasty and cemented primary total hip arthroplasty

411 ‡ including cemented hemiarthroplasty

- 412 § including internal fixation of fracture of neck of femur with nail or screw, internal fixation of
- 413 fracture of upper femur with screws and side plate, internal fixation of fracture of upper femur
- 414 with intramedullary nail, and other internal fixation of other parts of femur

415

416 Table 2. Use (visits or days) and costs (€) of healthcare and social services per person-year in physical-exercise and usual-care groups over 0—

417 12 and 0—24 months.

	Use of healthcare and social services			Costs (€) of healthcare and social services		
	Physical-exercise (n=61) Mean (SE)*	Usual-care (n=60) Mean (SE)*	IRR <sup>†</sup> (95% CI)	Physical-exercise (n=61) Mean (SE) <sup>‡</sup>	Usual-care (n=60) Mean (SE) <sup>‡</sup>	Mean ratio <sup>§</sup> (95% CI)
<b>0—12 months</b>						
Home care, visits	234.0 (45.8)	212.5 (53.9)	1.02 (0.57 to 1.83)	10 560 (2 018)	9 777 (2 403)	1.00 (0.31 to 1.69)
Primary care						
General practitioner, visits	12.7 (2.0)	9.4 (1.1)	1.32 (0.91 to 1.92)	1 637 (273)	1 135 (126)	1.45 (0.93 to 2.22)
Nurse, visits	21.8 (2.9)	22.9 (2.7)	0.93 (0.64 to 1.36)	1 112 (148)	1 245 (157)	0.89 (0.60 to 1.27)
Rehabilitation <sup>  </sup> , visits	94.8 (2.6)	18.2 (2.7)	5.32 (3.94 to 7.19)	8 812 (252)	3 568 (524)	2.55 (1.88 to 3.39)
Hospital wards, days	8.4 (3.6)	6.5 (2.3)	1.20 (0.44 to 3.22)	2 959 (1 299)	2 260 (812)	1.20 (0.31 to 3.55)
Home healthcare, visits	3.9 (0.9)	3.5 (0.6)	1.09 (0.58 to 2.06)	470 (102)	412 (73)	1.15 (0.63 to 2.29)
Specialized medical care						
Physician, visits	2.0 (0.4)	2.9 (0.5)	0.80 (0.50 to 1.30)	631 (137)	946 (186)	0.77 (0.45 to 1.30)

Nurse, visits	0.8 (0.3)	1.2 (0.3)	0.77 (0.35 to 1.71)	51 (20)	56 (13)	0.99 (0.36 to 2.56)
Emergency department, visits	1.8 (0.4)	1.7 (0.3)	1.18 (0.65 to 2.13)	626 (154)	676 (174)	1.04 (0.53 to 2.09)
Hospital wards, days	2.1 (0.7)	4.3 (0.9)	0.55 (0.23 to 1.28)	2 093 (820)	7 047 (3 652)	0.40 (0.14 to 1.25)
Nursing home, days	16.1 (8.6)	13.8 (9.1)	1.29 (0.25 to 6.68)	2 960 (1 515)	2 490 (1 532)	1.36 (0.05 to 15.55)
<b>Total costs</b>				<b>40 722 (3 947)</b>	<b>33 180 (5 808)</b>	<b>1.26 (0.87 to 1.86)</b>

---

**0—24 months**


---

Home care, visits	201.3 (41.5)	248.0 (64.3)	0.73 (0.39 to 1.37)	9 354 (1858)	11 472 (2846)	0.73 (0.38 to 1.43)
Primary care						
General practitioner, visits	11.0 (1.4)	9.5 (1.0)	1.12 (0.80 to 1.57)	1 540 (263)	1 151 (120)	1.34 (0.89 to 1.90)
Nurse, visits	21.4 (2.7)	20.8 (2.5)	1.02 (0.69 to 1.50)	1 074 (131)	1 130 (149)	0.97 (0.65 to 1.38)
Rehabilitation <sup>II</sup> , visits	53.0 (1.8)	11.7 (1.5)	4.59 (3.51 to 5.99)	5 547 (290)	2 556 (401)	2.23 (1.61 to 3.13)
Hospital wards, days	7.9 (2.6)	4.6 (1.3)	1.54 (0.68 to 3.51)	3 531 (1 354)	1 761 (625)	1.74 (0.61 to 4.39)
Home healthcare, visits	3.6 (0.7)	3.9 (0.6)	0.96 (0.56 to 1.63)	452 (85)	454 (70)	1.05 (0.66 to 1.85)
Specialized medical care						
Physician, visits	1.9 (0.3)	2.2 (0.3)	0.97 (0.64 to 1.48)	643 (132)	777 (165)	0.94 (0.56 to 1.63)
Nurse, visits	0.9 (0.3)	1.4 (0.4)	0.72 (0.30 to 1.72)	60 (22)	65 (18)	1.01 (0.36 to 2.58)

Emergency department, visits	1.3 (0.3)	1.2 (0.2)	1.11 (0.65 to 1.91)	545 (140)	558 (159)	1.11 (0.57 to 2.34)
Hospital wards, days	3.3 (0.8)	4.4 (0.9)	0.76 (0.40 to 1.47)	3 430 (895)	7 314 (3 643)	0.56 (0.23 to 1.40)
Nursing home, days	12.9 (5.9)	11.3 (7.1)	1.30 (0.30 to 5.58)	2 434 (1 035)	2 053 (1 167)	1.45 (0.32 to 14.30)
<b>Total costs</b>				<b>34 159 (3 857)</b>	<b>31 848 (5 663)</b>	<b>1.08 (0.77 to 1.70)</b>

---

418 \* use of healthcare and social services (Poisson rates per person-year)

419 † adjusted (age and sex) Incidence Rate Ratio, the physical-exercise group over the usual-care group

420 ‡ costs of healthcare and social services (mean costs per person-year)

421 § adjusted (age and sex) mean ratio, the physical-exercise group over the usual-care group, bootstrap (bias-corrected) with 95% confidence intervals

423 || including physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy and trial intervention (physiotherapist-supervised, home-based physical exercise)


425

426

427


428 Figure 1. Flowchart of the study.





430 Figure 2. Changes from baseline in total FIM scores over 12 months in the physical-exercise group  
431 and the usual-care group. Means and 95% CI; age and sex adjusted.

432



433

434

435

436

437


438

439

440

441 Figure 3. Differences between the costs per person-year (pyrs) over 24 months in the physical-  
 442 exercise and usual-care groups according to total FIM scores at baseline. The grey area represents  
 443 the 95% confidence interval. The curve was derived from a four-knot restricted cubic spline  
 444 generalized linear regression model adjusted for age and sex.

445



446

447

448

449 **REFERENCES**

- 450 1 Vochteloo AJ, Borger van der Burg BL, Tuinebreijer WE et al. Do clinical characteristics and  
451 outcome in nonagenarians with a hip fracture differ from younger patients? *Geriatr Gerontol Int*  
452 2013;13(1):190–197. doi: 10.1111/j.1447-0594.2012.00885.x.
- 453 2 Pajulammi HM, Pihlajamäki HK, Luukkaala TH, Nuotio MS. Pre- and perioperative predictors of  
454 changes in mobility and living arrangements after hip fracture. A population-based study. *Arch*  
455 *Gerontol Geriatr* 2015;61(2):182–189. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2015.05.007.
- 456 3 Dyer SM, Crotty M, Fairhall N et al. A critical review of the long-term disability outcomes  
457 following hip fracture. *BMC Geriatr* 2016;16(1):158. doi: 10.1186/s12877-016-0332-0.
- 458 4 Gjertsen JE, Baste V, Fevang JM, Furnes O, Engesæter LB. Quality of life following hip fractures:  
459 results from the Norwegian hip fracture register. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2016;17(1):265. doi:  
460 10.1186/s12891-016-1111-y.
- 461 5 Alexiou KI, Roushias A, Varitimidis SE, Malizos KN. Quality of life and psychological consequences  
462 in elderly patients after a hip fracture: A review. *Clin Interv Aging* 2018;Jan 24;13:143–150. doi:  
463 10.2147/CIA.S150067.
- 464 6 Haentjens P, Magaziner J, Colón-Emeric CS et al. Meta-analysis: Excess mortality after hip  
465 fracture among older women and men. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152(6):380–390. doi: 10.1059/0003-  
466 4819-152-6-201003160-00008.
- 467 7 Panula J, Pihlajamäki H, Mattila VM et al. Mortality and cause of death in hip fracture patients  
468 aged 65 or older - a population-based study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2011;12(1):105. doi:  
469 10.1186/1471-2474-12-105.

- 470 8 Katsoulis M, Benetou V, Karapetyan T et al. Excess mortality after hip fracture in elderly persons  
471 from Europe and the USA: the CHANCES project. *J Intern Med* 2017;281(3):300-310. doi:  
472 10.1111/joim.12586.
- 473 9 Williamson S, Landeiro F, McConnell T et al. Costs of fragility hip fractures globally: a systematic  
474 review and meta-regression analysis. *Osteoporos Int* 2017;28(10):2791–2800. doi:  
475 10.1007/s00198-017-4153-6.
- 476 10 Borgström F, Karlsson L, Ortsäter G et al. Fragility fractures in Europe: burden, management  
477 and opportunities. *Arch Osteoporos* 2020;15(1):59 doi: 10.1007/s11657-020-0706-y.
- 478 11 Burgers PTPW, Hoogendoorn M, Van Woensel EAC et al. Total medical costs of treating femoral  
479 neck fracture patients with hemi- or total hip arthroplasty: a cost analysis of a multicenter  
480 prospective study. *Osteoporos Int* 2016;27(6):1999–2008. doi: 10.1007/s00198-016-3484-z.
- 481 12 Fliss E, Weinstein O, Sherf M, Dreihier J. Healthcare services utilization following admission for  
482 hip fracture in elderly patients. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2018;30(2):104-109. doi:  
483 10.1093/intqhc/mzx178.
- 484 13 Cancio JM, Vela E, Santa Eugènia S, Clèries M, Inzitari M, Ruiz D. Long-term impact of hip  
485 fracture on the use of healthcare resources: a population-based study. *JAMDA* 2019;20(4):456-  
486 461. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2018.08.005.
- 487 14 Tajeu GS, Delzell E, Smith W et al. Death, debility, and destitution following hip fracture. *J*  
488 *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2014;69(3):346–353. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glt105.
- 489 15 Rapp K, Rothenbacher D, Magaziner J et al. Risk of nursing home admission after femoral  
490 fracture compared with stroke, myocardial infarction, and pneumonia. *JAMDA* 2015;16(8):715.e7–  
491 715.e12. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2015.05.013.

- 492 16 Hektoen LF, Saltvedt I, Sletvold O, Helbostadt JL, Lurås H, Halsteinli V. One-year health care  
493 costs after hip fracture for home-dwelling elderly in Norway. Results from the Trondheim Hip  
494 Fracture Trial. *Scand J Public Health* 2016;44(8):791-798. doi: 10.1177/1403494816674162.
- 495 17 Auais MA, Eilayyan O, Mayo NE. Extended exercise rehabilitation after hip fracture improves  
496 patient's physical function: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Phys Ther* 2012;92(11):1437-  
497 1451. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20110274.
- 498 18 Singh NA, Quine S, Clemson LM et al. Effects of high-intensity progressive resistance training  
499 and targeted multidisciplinary treatment of frailty on mortality and nursing home admissions after  
500 hip fracture: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMDA* 2012;13(1):24–30.  
501 doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2011.08.005.
- 502 19 Beaupre LA, Binder EF, Cameron ID et al. Maximising functional recovery following hip fracture  
503 in frail seniors. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2013;27(6): 771–788. doi:  
504 10.1016/j.berh.2014.01.001.
- 505 20 Salpakoski A, Törmäkangas T, Edgren J et al. Effects of multicomponent home-based physical  
506 rehabilitation program on mobility recovery after hip fracture: A randomized controlled trial.  
507 *JAMDA* 2014;15(5):361-368. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2013.12.083.
- 508 21 Edgren J, Salpakoski A, Sihvonen SE et al. Effects of a home-based physical rehabilitation  
509 program on physical disability after hip fracture: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMDA*  
510 2015;16(4):350.e1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2014.12.015.
- 511 22 Diong J, Allen N, Sherrington C. Structured exercise improves mobility after hip fracture: a  
512 meta-analysis with meta-regression. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(6):346-355. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-  
513 2014-094465.

- 514 23 Lee SY, Yoon B-H, Beom J et al. Effect of lower-limb progressive resistance exercise after hip  
515 fracture surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies. *JAMDA*  
516 2017;18(12):1096.e19-1096.e26. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2017.08.021.
- 517 24 Wu, D, Zhu X, Zhang S. Effect of home-based rehabilitation for hip fracture: A meta-analysis of  
518 randomized controlled trials. *J Rehabil Med* 2018;50(6):481–486. doi: 10.2340/16501977-2328.
- 519 25 Sherrington C, Tiedemann A, Cameron I. Physical exercise after hip fracture: an evidence  
520 overview. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 2011;47(2):297-307.
- 521 26 Kuijlaars IAR, Sweerts L, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MWG et al. Effectiveness of supervised home-  
522 based exercise therapy compared to a control intervention on functions, activities, and  
523 participation in older patients after hip fracture: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Phys*  
524 *Med Rehab* 2019;100(1):101-114.e6. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2018.05.006.
- 525 27 Crotty M, Unroe K, Cameron ID, Miller M, Ramirez G, Couzner L. Rehabilitation interventions  
526 for improving physical and psychosocial functioning after hip fracture in older people (Review).  
527 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010;20(1):CD007624. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007624.pub3.
- 528 28 Cheung W-H, Shen W-Y, Dai DL et al. Evaluation of a multidisciplinary rehabilitation programme  
529 for elderly patients with hip fracture: a prospective cohort study. *J Rehabil Med* 2018;50(3):285-  
530 291. doi: 10.2340/16501977-2310.
- 531 29 Taraldsen K, Thingstad P, Døhl Ø et al. Short and long-term clinical effectiveness and cost-  
532 effectiveness of a late-phase community-based balance and gait exercise program following hip  
533 fracture. The EVA-Hip Randomised Controlled Trial. *PLoS ONE* 2019;14(11): e0224971. doi:  
534 10.1371/journal.pone.0224971.

- 535 30 Milte R, Miller MD, Crotty M et al. Cost-effectiveness of individualized nutrition and exercise  
536 therapy for rehabilitation following hip fracture. *J Rehabil Med* 2016;48(4):378–85. doi:  
537 10.2340/16501977-2070.
- 538 31 Soukkio P, Suikkanen S, Kääriä S et al. Effects of 12-month home-based physiotherapy on  
539 duration of living at home and functional capacity among older persons with signs of frailty or with  
540 a recent hip fracture - protocol of a randomized controlled trial (HIPFRA study). *BMC Geriatr*  
541 2018;18(1):232. doi: 10.1186/s12877-018-0916-y.
- 542 32 Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. “Mini-mental state”. A practical method for grading the  
543 cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 1975;12(3):189–198. doi:  
544 10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6.
- 545 33 Kapiainen S, Väisänen A, Haula T. [Unit costs of health and social care in Finland 2011; in  
546 Finnish]. Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare (THL); 2014. Report No.:3/2014.  
547 <https://www.julkari.fi/handle/10024/114683>. Accessed March 18, 2021.
- 548 34 Granger CV, Hamilton BB, Zielezny M, Sherwin FS. Advances in functional assessment in medical  
549 rehabilitation. *Top Geriatr Rehabil* 1986;1(3):59–74.
- 550 35 Sund R, Juntunen M, Lüthje P et al. Monitoring the performance of hip fracture treatment in  
551 Finland. *Ann Med* 2011;43 Suppl 1:39–46. doi:10.3109/07853890.2011.586360.
- 552 36 NOMESCO (Nordic Medico-Statistical Committee Classification of Surgical Procedures).  
553 <https://norden.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:970547/FULLTEXT01.pdf>. Accessed March 18,  
554 2021.
- 555 37 Hilbe JM. *Modeling Count Data*. New York: Cambridge University Press; 2014.



- 556 38 Verbeek H, Meyer G, Leino-Kilpi H et al. RightTimePlaceCare Consortium. A European study  
557 investigating patterns of transition from home care towards institutional dementia care: the  
558 protocol of a RightTimePlaceCare study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):68. doi: 10.1186/1471-  
559 2458-12-68.
- 560 39 Blackburn J, Locher JL, Morrissey MA, Becker DJ, Kilgore ML. The effects of state-level  
561 expenditures for home and community-based services on the risk of becoming a long-stay nursing  
562 home resident after hip fracture. *Osteoporos Int* 2016;27(3):953–961. doi 10.1007/s00198-015-  
563 3327-3.
- 564 40 Berggren M, Karlsson Å, Lindelöf N et al. Effects of geriatric interdisciplinary home  
565 rehabilitation on complications and readmissions after hip fracture: a randomized controlled trial.  
566 *Clin Rehab* 2019;33(1):64–73. doi: 10.1177/0269215518791003.
- 567 41 Farag I, Howard K, O'Rourke S et al. Health and social support services in older adults recently  
568 discharged from hospital: service utilisation and costs and exploration of the impact of a home-  
569 exercise intervention. *BMC Geriatr* 2016;16(1):82. doi: 10.1186/s12877-016-0254-x.
- 570 42 Forrest G, Schwam A, Cohen E. Time of care required by patients discharged from rehabilitation  
571 unit. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2002;81(1):57–62. doi: 10.1097/00002060-200201000-00010.
- 572 43 Orwig DL, Hochberg M, Yu-Yahiro J et al. Delivery and outcomes of a yearlong home exercise  
573 program after hip fracture. A randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2011;171(4):323-331.  
574 doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2011.15.
- 575 44 Yu-Yahiro J, Resnick B, Orwig D, Hicks G, Magaziner J. Design and implementation of a home-  
576 based exercise program post-hip fracture: The Baltimore hip studies experience. *PM R*  
577 2009;1(4):308–318. doi: 10.1016/j.pmrj.2009.02.008.

578

579

580

581