Emergency Medicine: Open Access
ISSN: 2165-7548

Singh and Batterley, Emergency Med 2014, 4:3
DOI: 10.4172/2165-7548.1000187

Research Article Open Access

The Use of a Rehabilitation Team to Manage Outcome after Emergency Head Injury Admission

Rajiv Singh[1*] **and Julie Batterley**[2]

[1]*Consultant and Senior Lecturer in Rehabilitation & Physical medicine, Osborn Unit, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield S5 7AU, United Kingdom*

[2]*Clinical Nurse Specialist, Osborn Neurorehabilitation Unit, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield S5 7AU United Kingdom*

[*]**Corresponding author:** Rajiv Singh, Consultant and Senior Lecturer in Rehabilitation & Physical medicine, Osborn Unit, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield S5 7AU, United Kingdom, Tel: 0044 114 2715651; Fax: 0044 114 2715649; E-mail: rajiv.singh@sth.nhs.uk

Received date: December 12, 2013; **Accepted date:** March 26, 2014; **Published date:** March 29, 2014

Abstract

Background: The quality of care for head injury is still very variable with little coordination between different specialties. Acute care dominates, often with little regard to rehabilitation needs.

Objective: To improve the outcome of all head injury admissions to hospital, including mild and moderate, by creating a specialised head injury team to supervise a rehabilitation clinical pathway.

Patients and Methods: A head injury team was established to manage the care of all non-neurosurgical admissions with head injury to a large teaching hospital. Apart from inpatient care, the team coordinate the various services involved in the care of head injury, arrange suitable follow-up, support relatives and train healthcare staff on general wards in the treatment of head injured patients. Follow-up clinics at 6 weeks and 6 months were arranged.

Results: In the first three years of the service, the team managed the care of 812 admissions. Mean age was 44.3 years (SD24.8) and mean length of hospital stay was 6.1 days (SD10.9). Of these individuals, 674 attended for 6 month follow-up with 52.2% having a good outcome on Extended Glasgow Outcome Score. Patients and relatives feedback was excellent with an average score of 4.7/5 on overall satisfaction rating. Following presentations at national meetings and elsewhere, other centres in the United Kingdom are now setting up similar pathways.

Conclusions: A dedicated clinical pathway and head injury team can improve the quality of care for all admissions with head injury and enhance the role for Rehabilitation Medicine input at an early stage.

Keywords: Craniocerebral trauma; Critical pathways; Healthcare quality; Physical and rehabilitation medicine

Introduction

The management of head injury demands a wide variety of specialist skills and presents complex problems. Many individuals never seek medical advice or are discharged from accident and emergency departments with no follow-up and there is a high level of unmet need [1]. Those with a severe injury are usually admitted, often to neurosurgical or orthopaedic wards. But they are lucky if they ever receive neurological rehabilitation afterwards or ongoing referral for rehabilitation in the community. Furthermore, the management of those with mild or moderate injury is even more variable and patients can receive a wide range of level of care. Those who are admitted may end up under a number of different specialties; brain injury specialists in Rehabilitation Medicine are rarely involved at an early stage. There is no coordination of overall care needs and the lack of responsibility leaves patients and families with an unsatisfactory service and hospitals with a clinical governance risk. This situation is common all over the United Kingdom. In order to address this unhappy situation, we introduced an acute brain injury care pathway in Sheffield. The aim was to improve the quality of care for all brain injury admissions, not just those with a severe brain injury. Prior to the introduction of the pathway, head injuries in this region were admitted to different departments depending on their immediate need on admission without any thought to an overall coordination of care. Such specialties included general surgery, orthopaedics, neurosurgery, ENT, Care of Elderly, A&E beds or could be discharged the same day.

After admission there was no specialist input from a team specialising in brain injury. Patients were often being discharged with little support or regard for social circumstances. Their families were therefore often put under great strain and the lack of coordinated follow up and inconsistencies in quality of care put the hospital at significant clinical governance risk.

The introduction of national policies and standards including the National Services Framework for Long-term Neurological Conditions(NSF) and National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) Head Injury guidelines in 2005 [2-4] created a drive to develop head injury services. It was clear that many of the guideline requirements could be met by an appropriate head injury pathway, coordinated to meet the needs of patients. Since then, there have been further initiatives to improve the quality of Major Trauma services nationally. This has added to the impetus to improve head injury care [5,6].

In recent years, many different areas of medical practice have developed Clinical Pathways using a multidisciplinary team approach to set standards, assess quality of care, measure performance and avoid

inconsistencies of care [7-9]. Such pathways are attractive because they improve the quality of care and safety for patients and hopefully improve outcomes [10,11]. However, a literature search using MEDLINE and EMBASE revealed little in the published literature as regards use of such pathways in head injury management. In severe brain injury, a pathway has been shown to improve some patient outcomes and reduce costs [12]. A significant study by Fakhry et al. found that outcome could be improved but only included severe brain injuries [13]. Other studies have shown that a pathway reduced length of stay but other outcomes were unchanged [14,15]. However the aim in Sheffield was to improve the care of all admitted injuries not just the most severe injuries. There is a growing awareness of the significant risks to even those with moderate and mild brain injury [16] and the development of head injury guidelines has resulted in many such patients being admitted for overnight observation and management [17,18]. The aims of the pathway was to reduce the variations in quality of care for all admissions with TBI, to bring all admissions under a specialist in brain injury and to aid compliance with meeting national recommendations for head injury care. Clinical governance and patient safety are of vital importance and it was hoped that eventually it would be possible to show an improvement in long-term patient outcomes.

Methods and Development of Pathway

A taskforce was set up by a group of key brain injury stakeholders. This included local government, community health providers and voluntary sector organisations as well as hospital departments which routinely admit head injury patients. It was important that all TBI patients were included in the pathway. Six beds were set up as the Head Injury Observations Unit (HIOU). An Acute Brain Injury Team (ABIT) was created based in the Rehabilitation Medicine department to have the responsibility for the care of patients admitted to these beds. The team consists of a Brain Injury Specialist doctor, a Clinical Nurse Specialist and a Brain Injury Social Worker.

All patients admitted with head injury or suspected injury are admitted to the observation unit. Criteria for admission are based on the NICE guidelines for Head Injury [4]. These are extensive but include abnormal CT scans not admitted to neurosurgery, diminished Glasgow Coma Score or any unresolved clinical concerns that preclude discharge eg alcohol intoxication. The Unit can also take step-down patients from ITU while a management plan is made for ongoing care or management.

The pathway does not specify the exact treatment required in each of the parent specialties involved in head injury care. For instance it has not produced protocols for ITU, ENT or neurosurgical management; these protocols remain the responsibility of the relevant departments. The pathway is about coordinating overall care and being responsible for patients who do not fall clearly into specialties such as neurosurgery. Those patients initially admitted to neurosurgery or ITU are again taken up by the Brain Injury team on discharge from those units.

Each day, the team join the Emergency ward round and take over the care of any patients admitted the previous day. Referrals from other units such as Care of Elderly, can be seen and patients either taken over or advice given. The ABIT is therefore a key link between the varying elements of services that are involved in brain injury, including neurosciences, surgery, ENT, general medicine and care of elderly as well as community services. The team provides for smooth transitions between services as required and facilitates appropriate follow up or review by relevant specialists and ascribes to the use of a Rehabilitation model at an early stage to improve patient service and outcome.

Patients receive therapy input from neurorehabilitation staff who have the appropriate skill set and training for the head injury group. The team manages patients' care needs on the observation unit and if longer term in-patient care is required for brain injury rehabilitation then patients can be transferred to the main neurorehabilitation ward itself. This is useful for those with more severe injury who require a longer stay or for assessing detailed cognitive problems and safety issues for discharge.

Relatives are often forgotten in acute settings [19] yet have to deal with ill patients on discharge. Caregiver stress is recognised as a significant problem [20-22]. Considerable evidence is emerging that interventions directed at family support can be effective [20,23]. The team are active in supporting families to fulfil their role. The social worker has a key role to play in the interface with relatives and can point to resources such as local head injury groups, benefit agencies and several leaflets developed by the group. On discharge, patients are given contact numbers for continuing support and a referral to community brain injury services is made if needed.

Results and Discussion

To facilitate the new pathway, a number of operational policies, referral and transfer criteria, discharge checklist and documentation proformas had to be devised for head injury observation. A Head Injury follow-up Clinic has been set up for all patients including those discharged by Emergency department within 24 hrs. At the clinic, any on-going problems are identified and appropriate assessments undertaken. It is known that 5% of even mild head injuries have significant disabling symptoms at 1 year and that appropriate management of mild TBI can reduce the incidence of these symptoms [24,25]. The aim of the clinic is to reassure patients and treat any persisting symptoms or complications.

A key benefit of the pathway has been to educate other health staff as to the significance of head injury and its treatment. Intuitively, the training of staff and increased confidence in dealing with head injury should improve outcomes. However this is difficult to show with the use of appropriate objective outcome measures. A rolling programme to train nursing staff, junior doctors and therapists is in place and the profile of head injury management has been raised across the region. Indeed the pathway has been highlighted nationally through the British Society of Rehabilitation Medicine and other professional bodies as a model of excellence. Presentations on one year data at national and international meetings have highlighted the strengths of such a service and other regional units are looking at the pathway in order to try and recreate similar systems elsewhere. The pathway has featured in the local press and the team have lectured on various aspects of brain injury extensively. The team act as advocates for the importance of brain injury services and hopefully will influence future service development.

In the last year, the United Kingdom has followed models of Trauma care in other countries, most notably the United States and has set up Regional Major Trauma Centres.5,6 An important part of the care of such individuals is the rehabilitation that they receive [26]. The resulting development of Trauma Rehabilitation in the United Kingdom has acted as a fresh impetus to the role of Rehabilitation

Medicine specialists in the acute stages of traumatic injury and the brain injury team have been pivotal in the development of national as well as local Trauma rehabilitation systems.

For those of us who are interested in Rehabilitation Medicine (RM) as a specialty, the development of Head Injury and Trauma Rehabilitation pathways has presented an opportunity for RM to show its value within acute healthcare systems. Traditionally RM is involved at a later stage after injury if indeed at all. We now have an opportunity to make a difference to patients by introducing good rehabilitation principles at the outset of care rather than wait for referrals from other colleagues at a later stage. We believe strongly that all head injury patients who are discharged from A&E or after overnight stay, should be followed up by a specialist to reduce the incidence of future problems.

For the Hospital Trust, the problems of overall patient responsibility has been solved. Patients are now under a specialist in brain injury who will coordinate appropriate referrals and care. Decisions are taken and clinical governance is much improved.

The ultimate measure of success would be to show a change in objective outcomes after head injury. Unfortunately there is no previous record of head injury outcome measurement in our hospital until the team was set up and started to collect such data. It is therefore impossible to show a definitive improvement in any such outcome measure. Furthermore, it is known that head injury data is notoriously poorly coded [27] and there is considerable variation in the measures that different units use [28]. The most common measure that is used is the Extended Glasgow Outcome Score (E-GOS) [29]. Compared to most other measures it is relatively quick to administer and has less room for subjective reporting. This is the key outcome that we decided to report on. We have reported previously on one year data but numbers were understandably small and many people took time to become aware of the new service [30].

In Table 1 we present data from the first three years of admissions under the pathway. These are patients who returned to the head injury clinic at 6 months follow-up. In this period, there were 812 admissions to the pathway. Of these, 674 attended both the initial clinic and then follow-up at 6 months for evaluation of outcome using the Extended Glasgow Outcome Score (E-GOS).

From Table 1, it is clear that the majority of individuals had a mild or moderate injury with only 21% having a severe TBI. We also found that a considerable number of patients live alone and that depression was common with 32% showing significant depressive symptoms. It is already well known that mood disorders are common after brain injury [31,32]. Emotional difficulties are magnified in individuals with cognitive and physical impairments and our results highlight the need to address this. The role of the social worker in facilitating further input, discussion and referral to appropriate support groups has been invaluable. The early use of education, medication and neuropsychological input have all been beneficial.

		N	%
Gender	Male	460	68.3
	Female	214	31.7
Severity of Injury	Mild	239	35.5
	Moderate	293	43.5
	Severe	142	21.0
Aetiology	Assault	114	16.9
	Fall	336	49.9
	Road Traffic Accident	170	25.2
	Work accident	45	6.7
	Fits	9	1.3
Ethnicity	White	635	94.2
	Other	39	5.8
Home support	Alone	354	52.5
	Supported	320	47.5
Alcohol excess	Yes	182	27.0
	No	492	73.0
Warfarin	Yes	51	7.6
	No	623	92.4
CT Scan findings	Nil	246	36.4
	Contusions	191	28.4
	Intracranial bleed	164	24.3
	DAI	73	10.9
Depressive symptoms	Yes	219	32.4
	No	455	67.6
Glasgow Outcome Score	1-4	36	5.4
	5. Moderate Lower	120	17.8
	6. Moderate Upper	166	24.6
	7. Good Lower	203	30.1
	8. Good Upper	149	22.1
Age in yrs; mean (SD)	44.3(24.8)		
Length of Stay, days; mean (SD)	6.1(10.9)		

Table 1: Clinical and Demographic Features of Head Injury Admissions (based on 674 patients out of 812 who reattended at 6 months)

The majority of individuals had a good outcome using E-GOS (52%). This compares favourably to landmark studies which range from 44-49% [18,33,34].

Clearly these studies were in different populations but we would not expect there to be much difference in baseline demographics. These results certainly encourage us that the pathway is an effective way of treating head injury patients. We hope to continue to follow up this group over time but head injury studies suffer from very high attrition

rates and it will be difficult to show clear proof that the pathway has improved a hard outcome measure such as E-GOS.

One important outcome for local services has been the improvement of clinical governance with pathway responsibility and care decisions being taken. This may be reflected in the patient and relatives feedback forms given to 125 patients and 125 relatives in the cohort. Replies were received from 104 patients and 97 relatives. Patient's ratings scored an average of 4.8/5 on overall satisfaction with the service and relatives rated the service at 4.7/5. Such data is not always the most reliable outcome measure but these Patient Rated Outcome Measures (PROMS) are becoming increasingly important as a service outcome [35].

To the best of our knowledge, we do not know of any similar RM service in the United Kingdom to date but we know that other units are now looking to develop similar programmes after discussion with us. We suggest that this pathway may be a future model that RM professionals could look at to provide better care to individuals with brain injury and their families. It is also an opportunity for RM to enhance and extend its role in healthcare and improve clinical governance within health organisations. It would be interesting to know the experience of other healthcare professionals, particularly in other countries as to whether such pathways already exist and if they do, have outcomes been affected.

Implications/Future Work

This project found an effective and innovative way to manage patients who have traditionally fallen between several services. The initial results are highly promising. However in future we need more detailed analysis to demonstrate significant benefit over standard practice perhaps by running a trial. It would also be useful to analyze data to see if any other factors influence outcome eg gender or CT findings.

In future the team intend to extend their expertise into the development of other streams of acute rehabilitation eg Trauma Rehabilitation. Other units across the country have also visited the centre to try and copy the model pathway and it will be fascinating to see if similar programmes change the face of head injury management across the UK.

Financial Disclosure

No funding was required and no conflict of interest exists for any author.

Author Contribution; Rajiv Singh is the guarantor and lead writer. Julie Batterley helped with redrafts and wrote the protocols.

Implications of study; a dedicated head injury team, using a defined clinical pathway, can improve the outcomes of head injury care. Similar programmes are being set up in other units as a result.

References

1. Beecham J, Perkins M, Snell T, Knapp M (2009) Treatment paths and costs for young adults with acquired brain injury in the United Kingdom. Brain Inj 23: 30-38.
2. Department of Health (2000) The NHS Plan: a plan for investment, a plan for reform.
3. Department of Health (2005) National Service Framework for Long Term Conditions.
4. Department of Health (2007) National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, Clinical Guidelines for Head Injury.
5. National Audit Office (2010) Major Trauma care in England. London: The Stationery Office.
6. NHS (2010) Emergency urgent care services. Major Trauma services.
7. Kitchiner D, Bundred P (1996) Integrated care pathways. Arch Dis Child 75: 166-168.
8. Davies, R, Gray C (2009) Care pathways and designing the health-care built environment: an explanatory framework. Intl J Care Pathw 13: 7-16.
9. Kwan J, Sandercock P (2003) In-hospital care pathways for stroke: a Cochrane systematic review. Stroke 34: 587-588.
10. Kitchiner D, Bundred P (1998) Integrated care pathways increase use of guidelines. BMJ 317: 147-148.
11. Garnick DW, Hendricks AM, Brennan TA (1991) Can practice guidelines reduce the number and costs of malpractice claims? JAMA 266: 2856-2860.
12. Vitaz TW, McIlvoy L, Raque GH, Spain D, Shields CB (2001) Development and implementation of a clinical pathway for severe traumatic brain injury. J Trauma 51: 369-375.
13. Fakhry SM, Trask AL, Waller MA, Watts DD; IRTC Neurotrauma Task Force (2004) Management of brain-injured patients by an evidence-based medicine protocol improves outcomes and decreases hospital charges. J Trauma 56: 492-499.
14. Espinosa-Aguilar A, Reyes-Morales H, Huerta-Posada CE, de León IL, López-López F, et al. (2008) Design and validation of a critical pathway for hospital management of patients with severe traumatic brain injury. J Trauma 64: 1327-1341.
15. Mcilvoy L, Spain DA, Raque G, Vitaz T, Boaz P, et al. (2001) Successful incorporation of the Severe Head Injury Guidelines into a phased-outcome clinical pathway. J Neurosci Nurs 33: 72-78, 82.
16. Mooney G, Speed J, Sheppard S (2005) Factors related to recovery after mild traumatic brain injury. Brain Inj 19: 975-987.
17. Yates PJ, Williams WH, Harris A, Round A, Jenkins R (2006) An epidemiological study of head injuries in a UK population attending an emergency department. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 77: 699-701.
18. Thornhill S, Teasdale GM, Murray GD, McEwen J, Roy CW, et al. (2000) Disability in young people and adults one year after head injury: prospective cohort study. BMJ 320: 1631-1635.
19. Wallace CA, Bogner J, Corrigan JD, Clinchot D, Mysiw WJ, et al. (1998) Primary caregivers of persons with brain injury: life change 1 year after injury. Brain Inj 12: 483-493.
20. Nabors N, Seacat J, Rosenthal M (2002) Predictors of caregiver burden following traumatic brain injury. Brain Inj 16: 1039-1050.
21. Ergh TC, Rapport LJ, Coleman RD, Hanks RA (2002) Predictors of caregiver and family functioning following traumatic brain injury: social support moderates caregiver distress. J Head Trauma Rehabil 17: 155-174.
22. Marwit SJ, Kaye PN (2006) Measuring grief in caregivers of persons with acquired brain injury. Brain Inj 20: 1419-1429.
23. Kreutzer JS, Stejskal TM, Ketchum JM, Marwitz JH, Taylor LA, et al. (2009) A preliminary investigation of the brain injury family intervention: impact on family members. Brain Inj 23: 535-547.
24. Ponsford J, Willmott C, Rothwell A, Cameron P, Kelly AM, et al. (2002) Impact of early intervention on outcome following mild head injury in adults. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 73: 330-332.
25. Paniak C, Toller-Lobe G, Durand A, Nagy J (1998) A randomized trial of two treatments for mild traumatic brain injury. Brain Inj 12: 1011-1023.
26. NHS Clinical Advisory Group (2010) Regional Trauma Networks for Major Trauma.
27. Maas AI (2009) Standardisation of data collection in traumatic brain injury: key to the future? Crit Care 13: 1016.
28. Rivara FP, Ennis SK, Mangione-Smith R, MacKenzie EJ, Jaffe KM (2012) Variation in adherence to new quality-of-care indicators for the acute rehabilitation of children with traumatic brain injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 93:1371-1376.

29. Wilson JT, Pettigrew LE, Teasdale GM (1998) Structured interviews for the Glasgow Outcome Scale and the extended Glasgow Outcome Scale: guidelines for their use. J Neurotrauma 15: 573-585.

30. Singh R, Venkateshwara G, Kirkland J, Batterley J, Bruce S (2012) Clinical pathways in head injury: improving the quality of care with early rehabilitation. Disabil Rehabil 34: 439-442.

31. Bombardier CH, Fann JR, Temkin NR, Esselman PC, Barber J, et al. (2010) Rates of major depressive disorder and clinical outcomes following traumatic brain injury. JAMA 303: 1938-1945.

32. Fann JR, Hart T, Schomer KG (2009) Treatment for depression after traumatic brain injury: a systematic review. J Neurotrauma 26: 2383-2402.

33. Elf K, Nilsson P, Enblad P (2002) Outcome after traumatic brain injury improved by an organized secondary insult program and standardized neurointensive care. Crit Care Med 30: 2129-2134.

34. MRC CRASH Trial Collaborators, Perel P, Arango M, Clayton T, Edwards P, et al. (2008) Predicting outcome after traumatic brain injury: practical prognostic models based on large cohort of international patients. BMJ 336: 425-429.

35. Marshall S, Haywood K, Fitzpatrick R (2006) Impact of patient-reported outcome measures on routine practice: a structured review. J Eval Clin Pract 12: 559-568.