A Modern Approach to Heart Failure Rehab

Rod Taylor

Professor of Population Health Research, University of Glasgow. Professor of Health Services Research, NIHR Senior Investigator, & Co-Director of Exeter Clinical Trials Unit, University of Exeter Medical School





Edinburgh Napier University 1st Cardiovascular Health Conference: A focus on physical activity interventions, 7th Nov 2019

Declaration of interest

 Chief investigator for number of rehab clinical trials & Academic lead Cochrane Cardiac Rehabilitation consortium



Presentation

- What is the current evidence base?
- What do the guidelines say?
- Challenges to provision?
 - access
 - multimorbidity
- Innovative (modern) approaches to delivery
 - REACH-HF
 - Digital solutions?





Meta-Analyses Exercise/Rehabilitation for Heart Failure

Pubmed (((exercise OR rehabilitation) AND (meta-analysis OR systematic review))) AND heart failure [Title]



Cochrane Meta-analyses Participant Characteristics



	Cochrane v1 Rees et al (2004)	Cochrane v2 Davies et al (2010)	Cochrane v3 Sagar et al (2014)	Cochrane v4 Long et al (2019)
N trials	29 RCTs	19 RCTs	33 RCTs	44 RCTs
N patients	1,126	3,647	4,740	5,783
Age in years: median	60 yrs	56 yrs	60.5 yrs	62.5 yrs
% male: median	91%	95%	87%	81%
Ejection fraction (%): median	NR [all <40%]	28%	29%	32.5%
Included HFpEF	0/29	0/19	5/33	7/44
Included NHYA IV	0/29	4/19	6/33	8/44
Follow up in months: median [range]	4 [1 to 26]	6 [6 to 60]	6 [6 to 120]	6 [6 to 120]

Impact of Exercise-based CR for HF 2019 Cochrane Review

0	utcome			N RC	CTs	N pa	atie	nts	Pooled relati risk (95% CI)	ve	Hete	rogeneity
Α	II-cause mo	rtal	itv									
- 1		E	cercise		C	ontrol			Mean Difference	M	lean Diffe	rence
<	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV,	Random,	95% CI
_	Antonicelli 2016	28.6	12.3	150	44.5	12.3	163	7.6%	-15.90 [-18.63, -13.17]			
>	Austin 2005	22.9	14.7	85	36.9	21.3	94	6.7%	-14.00 [-19.32, -8.68]		-: IN	Ninnesota
-	Belardinelli 1999	40	19	48	51	22	46	5.4%	-11.00 [-19.33, -2.67]		• • • "	
_	Chen 2018	19.4	12.2	31	34.3	14.4	29	6.1%	-14.90 [-21.68, -8.12]		ר נ	iving with HF
Α	Dalal 2018	24.1	20.9	92	27.5	23.2	93	6.3%	-3.40 [-9.76, 2.96]			
- 1	Davidson 2010	52.9	15.7	50	56.4	18.3	42	6.0%	-3.50 [-10.54, 3.54]			
<	Dracup 2007	35.7	23.7	86	43.2	27.3	87	5.7%	-7.50 [-15.12, 0.12]			
_	Du 2018	36.9	21.59	67	41	22.4	65	5.8%	-4.10 [-11.61, 3.41]			
	Gary 2010	25.6	19.7	17	28.9	29.9	14	2.4%	-3.30 [-21.55, 14.95]			
-	Gary 2010	24.2	16.3	15	34.3	23.6	16	3.3%	-10.10 [-24.30, 4.10]			
	JOIIY 2009	37.6	21	11	34.9	24.8	80	5.9%	2.70 [-4.48, 9.88]			
Н	Koukouvou 2004	34.1	13	16	45.2	9	19	5.7%	-11.10 [-18.65, -3.55]			
••	Lang 2018 Malkabia 2002	29.2	25.8	22	38.7	30.1	23	2.8%	-9.50 [-25.86, 6.86]			_
h	MICKEIVIE 2002	-3.4	18.1	57	-3.3	13.9	07	0.0%	-0.10 [-5.86, 5.66]	_		
	NIISSUN 2008 Deceire 2008	23	14	30	28	20	31	5.0%	-5.00 [-12.94, 2.94]			
	Mithom 2012	3Z 15 A	20.0	44	23	121	41	3.070 6.604	-21.00[-33.54,-8.40]			
_	Volumenti 2012 Volu 2014	10.4	14.0	40	11.3	12.1	44 60	7 00%	4.10[-1.39, 9.79]			
Cd	10112011	15	4	50	10	0	50	1.070	-5.00 [-7.00, -3.00]			
و ا	Total (95% CI)			985			1010	100.0%	-7.11 [-10.49, -3.73]		•	
	Heterogeneity: Tau² =	36.91; (Chi ² = 93	3.22, di	f=17 (P	< 0.0	0001);	² =82%	_	-20 -	10 0	10 20
	Test for overall effect:	Z= 4.12	(P < 0.0	0001)						Favours exp	ercise Fa	avours control

Cochrane Meta-analyses Intervention Characteristics



	Cochrane v1 Rees et al (2004)	Cochrane v2 Davies et al (2010)	Cochrane v3 Sagar et al (2014)	Cochrane v4 Long et al (2019)				
Overall duration: median [range]	6 months [1 to 30]							
Frequency: median [range]	3 sessions/wk [1 to 7]							
Length, min/session: median [range]	30 mins/session [8 to 60]							
Intensity Maximal heart rate VO ₂ max Bora ratina	40 to 80% 50 to 85% 11 to 18							
Exercise-only programmes	28/29	16/19	25/33	31/44				
Aerobic & resistance interventions	8/29	5/19	12/33	12/44				
Exclusively home- based programmes	0/29	2/19	6/33	9/44				

Explaining outcome variation Trial level characteristics

	All-cause mortality P value	All hospitalisations P value	MLWHF P value	All HRQoL outcomes P value
Type of rehabilitation (exercise only vs com- prehensive)	0.72	0.55	0.22	0.49
Type of exercise (aer- obic training alone vs aerobic plus resistance training)	0.93	0.06	0.15	0.66
Exercise dose (number of weeks ×number of sessions/week ×average duration of session in hours)	0.10	0.44	0.89	0.71
Exercise setting (hospi- tal only, home only, both hospital and home)	0.09	0.60	0.62	0.08
Single vs multi-centre	0.46	0.60	0.09	0.06
Publication date	0.20	0.78	0.67	0.74
Risk of bias	0.28	0.05	0.01	0.01

Journal of the American College of Cardiology © 2012 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation Published by Elsevier Inc.

0.17

1-3

0-1

3-5

MET-hr per week

5-7

>=7

Heart Failure Relation Between Volume of Exercise and Clinical Outcomes in Patients With Heart Failure Steven J. Ketevian, PHD,* Eric S. Leifer, PHD,† Nancy Houston-Miller, BSN,‡ William E. Kraus, MD, § Clinton A. Brawner, MS,* Christopher M. O'Connor, MD, § David J. Whellan, MD, ¶ Lawton S. Cooper, MD, † Jerome L. Fleg, MD, † Dalane W. Kitzman, MD,# Alain Cohen-Solal, MD,** James A. Blumenthal, PHD,++ David S. Rendall, PA-C,§ Ileana L. Piña, MD, MPH, ‡‡ for the HF-ACTION Investigators 2.0 Detroit, Michigan; Bethesda, Maryland; Stanford, California; Durham and Winston-Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Paris, France; and Bronx, New York 1.5 1.0 Hazard Ratio 0.75 0.50 0.33

European Journal of Heart Failure (2018) doi:10.1002/ejhf.1311

RESEARCH ARTICLE

National Institute for Health Research

Impact of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation in patients with heart failure (ExTraMATCH II)

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY © 2019 PUBLISHED BY ELSEVIER ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY FOUNDATION

FSC

European Society of Cardiology

Impact of Rehabilitative Exercise on Functional Capacity and Quality-of-Life in Patients With Heart Failure

Rod S. Taylor, РнD,^a Sarah Walker, РнD,^b Neil A. Smart, РнD,^c Massimo F. Piepoli, MD, Oriana Ciani, РнD,^{b,f} David Whellan, MD, MHS,^g Christopher O'Connor, MD,^h Steven J. Andrew Coats, DM,^j Constantinos H. Davos, MD,^k Hasnain M. Dalal, MD,^{b,l} Kathleen D Lorraine S. Evangelista, РнD,ⁿ Kate Jolly, РнD,^o Jonathan Myers, РнD,^p Birgitta B. Nilss Claudio Passino, MD,^r Miles D. Witham, РнD,^s Gloria Y. Yeh, MD,^t on behalf of the ExT





VOL. 73. NO. 12. 2019

Α

		Coefficient (95% CI)	p-Value for Interaction
Age (years)			
Less than 60		-7.76 (-13.7, -1.88)	0.912
60 and over		-5.02 (-10.8, 0.75)	
Sex			
Male		-7.42 (13.6, -1.27)	0.592
Female		-3.44 (-8.10, 1.22)	
Ejection fraction (%)			
HFrEF		-6.48 (-13.3, 0.32)	0.165
HFpEF		-6.07 (-15.0, 2.89)	
NYHA class			
1/11		-3.95 (-8.67, 0.77)	0.061
III/IV		-10.2 (-16.7, -3.68)	
Heart failure aetiology			
Ischaemic		-5.50 (-11.7, 0.74)	0.477
Non-ischaemic		-7.04 (-13.7, -0.37)	
Ethnic group			
White		-5.68 (-11.1, -0.24)	0.169
Non-white		-5.29 (-13.1, 2.47)	
Peak VO2 (ml/kg/min)			
Less than 15		-12.1 (-24.2, 0.12)	0.262
15 and over		-3.29 (-6.96, 0.38)	
Overall		-5 94 (-10 9 -1 01)	
Overatt		5.5+(10.5, 1.01)	
	-20 -15 -10 -5 0 5		





Exercise Training in Patients with Heart Failure and Preserved Ejection Fraction: A Meta-analysis of Randomized Control Trials Ambarish Pandey, Akhil Parashar, Dharam Kumbhani, Sunil Agarwal, Jalaj Garg, Dalane

Ambarish Pandey, Akhil Parashar, Dharam Kumbhani, Sunil Agarwal, Jalaj Garg, Dala Kitzman, Benjamin Levine, Mark Drazner and Jarett D. Berry

WMD (95% CI) % Weight Study 0.02 (-0.22, 0.26) 13.68 Study Kitzman 2010 WMD (95% CI) 0.09 (-0.01, 0.19) 72.43 Alves 2012 Kitzman 2010 2.60 (1.38, 3.82) 0.07 (-0.19, 0.33) 11.62 Smart 2012 Edelmann 2011 4.00 (1.97, 6.03) 0.04 (-0.54, 0.62) 02.27 Kitzman 2013 0.08 (-0.01, 0.16) 100.0 **Overall Effect** Smart 2012 1.60 (-2.61, 5.81) I2= 0.00%; p =0.96 Test for overall effect; p= 0.08 1.80 (-0.54, 4.14) Kitzman 2013 - 4 - 2 0 2 4 .6 ← Favors control Favors exercise → 2.72 (1.79, 3.65) **Overall Effect** Change in E/A I2= 0.00%; p = 0.49 Test for overall effect; p= 0.0001 Study WMD (95% Cl) % Weight Kitzman 2010 -6 -2 0 2 16.0 (-13.55, 45.55) 52.87 ← Favors control Smart 2012 Favors exercise → 2.00 (-44.64, 48.64) 21.22 Change in peak oxygen uptake Kitzman 2013 -23.00 (-65.21, 19.21) 25.91 **Overall Effect** 2.92 (18.56, 24.41) 100.0 l2= 9.2%; p =0.33 Test for overall effect; p= 0.79 Favors exercise → ← Favors control Change in Early deceleration time

Circ Heart Fail. published online November 16, 2014;



European Heart Journal (2012) **33**, 1787–1847 doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehs104

ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treat of acute and chronic heart failure 2012

The Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute Chronic Heart Failure 2012 of the European Society of Car Developed in collaboration with the Heart Failure Associatic of the ESC

Recommendations for exercise prescription and multidisciplinary management

Recommendations	Class ^a	Level ^b	Ref ^c
It is recommended that regular aerobic exercise is encouraged in patients with heart failure to improve functional capacity and symptoms.	I	A	262, 263
It is recommended that patients with heart failure are enrolled in a multidisciplinary-care management programme to reduce the risk of heart failure hospitalization.	I	A	236, 259, 264

ACC/AHA Practice Guidelines

ACC/AHA 2005 Guideline Update for the Diagnosis and Management of Chronic Heart Failure in the Adult

A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Update the 2001 Guidelines for the Evaluation and

Class I

7. Exercise training is beneficial as an adjunctive approach to improve clinical status in ambulatory patients with current or prior symptoms of HF and reduced LVEF. (Level of Evidence: B)

But <u>access</u> remains a problem...





Chronic heart failure in adults: diagnosis and management

NICE guideline Published: 12 September 2018 <u>nice.org.uk/guidance/ng106</u>

ealthcare

A national clinical guideline

Improvement

Offer exercise based cardiac rehabilitation therapy to people with stable heart failure in a format and setting that is easily accessible.

SIGN

July 2017

Cardiac rehabilitation services should offer individualised exercise assessments, tailor the exercise component of their programmes to individual choice and deliver them in a range of settings.



JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY © 2019 BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF CARDIOVASCULAR AND PULMONARY REHABILITATION, THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION, INC., AND THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY FOUNDATION PUBLISHED BY ELSEVIER

AACVPR/AHA/ACC SCIENTIFIC STATEMENT

Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation

A Scientific Statement From the American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation, the American Heart Association, and the American College of Cardiology

VOL. 74. NO. 1. 2019

openheart Home-based versus centre-based cardiac rehabilitation: abridged Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis

S A Buckingham,¹ R S Taylor,² K Jolly,³ A Zawada,⁴ S G Dean,² A Cowie,⁵

R J Norton,⁶ H M Dalal^{1,2}

Open Heart 2016;3:e000463. doi:10.1136/openhrt-2016-000463

Outcome or subgroup	Number of studies	Number of participants	Summary estimate and model	Effect estimate (95% Cl) with p values where significant
Exercise capacity	,			
≤12-month	19	1876	Standard mean	-0.10 (-0.29 to 0.08)
follow-up			difference,	
			random-effects model	
12–24-month	3	1074	Standard mean	0.11 (-0.01 to 0.23)
follow-up			difference,	
			fixed-effects model	
Blood pressure (n	nm Hg) at 3-	-12-month follow	-up	
Systolic	9	1117	Mean difference,	0.19 (-3.37 to 3.75)
Disstalia	0	001	random-effects model	
Diastolic	8	991	fixed offects model	-1.86(-2.95(0-0.76))
			lixed-ellects model	aroup (p=0.009)
Cholesterol (mmc	ol/L) at 3_12-	month follow-up		group (p=0.009)
Total	9	1109	Mean difference	-0.07(-0.24 to 0.11)
i o tai	Ũ	1100	random-effects model	
HDL	7	883	Mean difference,	-0.07 (-0.11 to -0.03)
			fixed-effects model	lower in centre-based
				group (p=0.001)
LDL	5	388	Mean difference,	-0.06 (-0.27 to 0.15)
			random-effects model	
Triglycerides	5	354	Mean difference,	-0.16 (-0.38 to 0.07)
o I.: (o			random-effects model	
Smoking (3–	6	986	Relative risk,	0.98 (0.79 to 1.21)
12 months)	10	1004	fixed-effects model	
12 months) Completers	18	1984	fixed-effects model Risk ratio, fixed-effects	1.04 (1.01 to 1.07)
12 months) Completers	18	1984	fixed-effects model Risk ratio, fixed-effects model	1.04 (1.01 to 1.07) higher completion in
12 months) Completers	18	1984	fixed-effects model Risk ratio, fixed-effects model	1.04 (1.01 to 1.07) higher completion in home-based group (n=0.009)
12 months) Completers Mortality	18	1984	fixed-effects model Risk ratio, fixed-effects model Belative risk.	1.04 (1.01 to 1.07) higher completion in home-based group (p=0.009) 0.79 (0.43 to 1.47)

The REACH-HF Intervention



REACH multicentre UK Trial

Full research paper The effects and costs of hon rehabilitation for heart failur with reduced ejection fraction The REACH-HF multicentre randomized controlled trial	Preventive Cardiology ne-based re on:	EUROPEAN Society of Cardiology Control of Preventive Cardiology 0(00) 1-11 Confection of the European Society of Cardiology 2018 Confection Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions Dot: 10.1177/2047487318060358 journals.sagepub.com/home/ejpc		
Hasnain M Dalal ^{1,2} , Rod S Taylor ¹ , Kate Jolly ³ , Russell C Davis ⁴ , Patrick Doherty ⁵ , Jackie Miles ⁶ , Robin van Lingen ⁷ , Fiona C Warren ¹ , Colin Green ¹ , Jennifer Wingham ¹ , Colin Greaves ⁸ , Susannah Sadler ¹ , Melvyn Hillsdon ⁹ ,		MLWHF	Mean Diff (95% CI) at 12mth	P- value
Charles Abraham ¹⁹ , Nicky Britten ¹ , Julia F Christopher Hayward ¹² , Victoria Eyre ¹³ , K Chim C Lang ¹⁵ and Karen Smith ¹⁶ ; on beh investigators	Frost', Sally Singh'', evin Paul ¹⁴ , alf of the REACH-HF	Total	-5.7 (-10.6 to -0.7)	0.025
		Physical	-3.2 (-5.7 to -0.6)	0.02
		Emotional	-0.8 (-2.2 to 0.6)	0.27



REACH-HF Economic modelling - Design

NICE reference case

- Perspective: NHS & PSS
- Time horizon: lifetime
- Utility measure: EQ-5D
- Costs: Published UK costs 2015/16
- Discounting: 3.5%/annum

Model inputs

- REACH-HFrEF trial, Cochrane
 2014 review, CHARM trial, THIN
 d/base, Cowie cohort, & SHIFT
- HF admissions

Comparisons

- REACH-HF + usual care vs usual care alone
- Home-based CR + usual care vs usual care alone

HF-specific-hos	pitalisations ORs
-----------------	-------------------

	Exerc	ise	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.4.1 Centre-based							
Belardinelli 1999	5	50	14	49	27.4%	0.28 [0.09, 0.85]	
Cowie 2014 (centre)	3	15	5	8	11.3%	0.15 [0.02, 1.01]	
Giannuzzi 2003	2	45	1	45	2.1%	2.05 [0.18, 23.41]	
Hambrecht 1995	0	12	1	10	3.4%	0.25 [0.01, 6.94]	
Jónsdóttir 2006a	0	21	3	22	7.2%	0.13 [0.01, 2.67]	
Mueller 2007	2	25	3	25	6.0%	0.64 [0.10, 4.19]	
Myers 2000	0	12	2	13	5.0%	0.18 [0.01, 4.25]	
Willenheimer 2001	0	23	3	27	6.8%	0.15 [0.01, 3.04]	
Witham 2012	1	53	1	54	2.1%	1.02 [0.06, 16.73]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		256		253	71.2%	0.33 [0.17, 0.63]	◆
Total events	13		33				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4	.79, df = 1	8 (P = 0	1.78); l² =	0%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.32 (F	° = 0.00	009)				
1.4.2 Home-based							
Cowie 2014 (home)	8	15	5	8	6.6%	0.69 [0.12, 3.96]	
Jolly 2009	4	84	2	85	4.1%	2.08 [0.37, 11.65]	
Passino 2006	0	44	2	41	5.5%	0.18 [0.01, 3.81]	
REACH-HFrEF	3	107	6	106	12.6%	0.48 [0.12, 1.97]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		250		240	28.8%	0.70 [0.30, 1.60]	
Total events	15		15				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2	.57, df = 3	3 (P = 0	.46); I ² =	0%			
Test for overall effect: 2	C = 0.85 (F	P = 0.39	3)				
Total (95% CI)		506		493	100.0%	0.43 [0.26, 0.72]	•
Total events	28		48				-
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9	14. df = 1	12 (P =	0.69): P	= 0%			
Test for overall effect: 2	= 3.21 (F	P = 0.00	01)				0.005 0.1 1 10 200
Tect for cubaroup diffe	rancae. C	bi₹ = 1	95 df=	(P = 0)	16) F=	48.7%	Favours expercise Favours control



REACH-HF cost-effectiveness





REACH-HFpEF pilot

Open Access	, ,		Research
BMJ Open	A randor facilitate intervent failure w and their Pilot Stu Chim C Lang, ¹ Ka Colin J Greaves, ³ Patrick Joseph Do Robin Van Lingen, Susannah Sadler, ³	nised controlled d home-based re tion in patients w rith preserved ej caregivers: the dy ren Smith, ^{1,2} Jennifer Wingham, ³ Fiona C Warren, ³ Colin Green, ³ K oherty, ⁸ Jackie Miles, ⁹ Nicky Britte ¹⁰ Sally J Singh, ¹¹ Kevin Paul, ¹² N Christopher Hayward, ¹⁴ Hayes I	trial of a ehabilitation with heart ection fraction REACH-HFpEF
	behalf of the REAG	CH-HE investigators MLWHF	Mean Diff (95% CI) at 6-months
		Total	-11.5 (-22.8 to 0.3)
		Physical	-4.7 (-0.1 to 0.8)
		Emotional	-2.7 (-6.0 to 0.6)



Implementation: REACH-HF Beacon sites





SCOT:REACH-HF project

- Implementation of an evidence-based cardiac rehabilitation home programme for heart failure patients and their caregivers in Scotland
- Methods
 - 3 Health Boards 45 HF patients per site
 - Assess patient outcomes pre and post REACH-HF e.g. MLWHF/ISWT/hospitalisation
 - Qualitative interviews with healthcare staff
 - Research funding: support training of staff/manuals/evaluation



International Journal of Cardiovascular Sciences. 2018;31(4)443-450

REVIEW ARTICLE

Telerehabilitation for Cardiac Patients: Systematic Review

Danieli de Cristo,¹ Natan Pinto do Nascimento,¹ Alexandre Simões Dias,² Amanda Sachetti¹

Universidade de Passo Fundo (UPF),¹ Rio Grande do Sul, RS - Brazil Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul,² Rio Grande do Sul, RS - Brazil

STEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS



Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation Alone and Hybrid With Center-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation in Heart Failure: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Hafiz M. Imran, MD; Muhammad Baig, MD; Sebhat Erqou, MD; Tracey H. Taveira, Pharm D; Nishant R. Shah, MD, MPH, MSc; Alan Morrison, MD, PhD; Gaurav Choudhary, MD; Wen-Chih Wu, MD, MPH

Conclusions

Exercise-based intervention (rehabilitation)....

- improves health-related quality of life of HF patients and reduces their risk of unplanned hospitalisation admission
 - majority of evidence in HFrEF

•	15 a Cia	55 I	level A l	ecomme	inuation (JIESC and	
	AHA/AC			%	Mean Age	All Diagnosis/Treatment Groups % with two or more comorbidities	\odot
		Male	Group-Based	76.6	64	52.7	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
			Home-Based	8.4	66	49.3	British Heart Foundation
•	But only		Web-Based	0.2	56	41.9	C National
		Female	Group-Based	72.2	66	56.3	IN JAUGII
	America		Home-Based	9.9	70	55.9	NHS
•	Need fo		Web-Based	0.1	60	64.3	Digital

is a Class 1 level A recommendation of ESC and

traditional outpatient hospital programmes – home/community and **digitally supported and consider comorbidity**

Thank you!

rod.taylor@gla.ac.uk