Use of the International Classification of Functioning and Disability to Develop Evidence-Based Practice Guidelines for Treatment of Common Musculoskeletal Conditions

> Sponsored by Orthopaedic Section American Physical Therapy Association

> > February 15, 2007 Combined Sections Meeting Boston, MA

Purpose of Project

• To use the International Classification of Functioning and Disability (ICF) to develop evidence-based practice guidelines to enhance diagnosis, intervention, prognosis and assessment of outcomes for a variety of musculoskeletal conditions commonly managed by physical therapists

ICF

- Model of disablement developed by WHO in 2001
- Classifies function & disability in terms of:
 - Body structure
 - Body function
 - Activity
 - Participation

ICF-Based Practice Guidelines

Expected Benefits:

- Advance orthopaedic physical therapist practice
- Guide for professional & postprofessional education
- Establish agenda for future research

ICF-Based Practice Guidelines

Develop for 7 Body Regions:

- Foot & ankle
- Knee
- Hip
- Lumbosacral spine
- Cervicothoracic spine
- Shoulder
- Elbow, wrist & hand

Purpose of Presentation

Objectives:

- Overview of project
- Description of ICF Model
- Describe project methodology
- Present preliminary ICF-based practice guidelines for foot & ankle, hip and cervicothoracic spine

Program Outline

- Introduction to Project & Overview of ICF Joe Godges DPT, MA OCS
- Overview of Project Methodology James Irrgang PT PhD ATC
- Guidelines for Hip Fractures Mike Cibulka PT OCS & Douglas White DPT
- Guidelines for Cervicothoracic Conditions – John Childs PT PhD OCS FAAOMPT & Joshua A. Cleland PT PhD OCS FAAOMPT
- Guidelines for Plantar Fasciitis Thomas McPoil PT PhD ATC
- Discussion Questions & Answers







Aims of ICF

- to provide a scientific basis for consequences of health conditions
- to establish a *common language* to improve communications

Aims of ICF

- to permit comparison of data across:
 - countries
 - · health care disciplines
 - services
 - time
- to provide a systematic coding scheme for health information systems

Foundations of ICF

Human Functioning	- <u>not</u>	merely disability
Universal Model	- <u>not</u>	a minority model
Interactive Model	- <u>not</u>	linear progressive
Integrative Model	- <u>not</u>	merely medical

Foundations of ICF

Human Functioning - not merely disability

Human Functioning	not disability alone
Body functionsBody structures	<i>vs</i> impairments
Activities	<i>vs</i> activity limitation
 Participation 	vs handicap





Universal Modelvs.Minority ModelImage: Market StateImage: Market StateImage: Market StateEveryone may have disability
Continuum
Multi-dimensionalImage: Certain Impairment groups
Categorical
Uni-dimensional

Foundations of ICF

Interactive Model - not a linear progression

$\begin{array}{l} \text{Sequence of Concepts} \\ \text{ICIDH 1980} \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{l} \text{Disease} \\ \text{or} \\ \text{or} \end{array} \rightarrow \text{Impairments} \rightarrow \text{Disabilities} \rightarrow \text{Handicaps} \end{array}$









Activities and Participation

- 1 Learning & Applying Knowledge
- 2 General Tasks and Demands
- 3 Communication
- 4 Movement
- 5 Self Care
- 6 Domestic Life Areas
- 7 Interpersonal Interactions
- 8 Major Life Areas
- 9 Community, Social & Civic Life

ICF Components with clear Orthopaedic Physical Therapy Implications

Body Functions: Sensory functions and pain Neuromusculoskeletal and movement-related functions

Body Structures: **Structures related to movement** Activities and Participation: **Movement**

Purpose of Ortho Section's ICF Project

Use the ICF to develop evidencebased practice guidelines to enhance diagnosis, intervention, prognosis and assessment of outcomes for a variety of musculoskeletal conditions commonly managed by physical therapists **Potential Benefits of the Project**

• Describe evidence-based practice guidelines for musculoskeletal disorders commonly managed by orthopaedic physical therapists

Potential Benefits of the Project

• Classify and define common musculoskeletal conditions using the World Health Organization's terminology

Potential Benefits of the Project

• Identify interventions supported by current best evidence to address impairments and activity restrictions associated with common musculoskeletal conditions

Potential Benefits of the Project

• Identify appropriate outcome measures to assess changes resulting from physical therapy interventions

Potential Benefits of the Project

 Provide a description to policy makers, using internationally accepted terminology, of orthopaedic physical therapists as practitioners who examine, design plans of care, and provide interventions to address impairments of body structure and function, activity limitations and participation restrictions

Potential Benefits of the Project

• Provide guidelines for payers and claims reviewers regarding the practice of orthopaedic physical therapy for common musculoskeletal conditions **Potential Benefits of the Project**

• Create a reference publication for orthopaedic physical therapy clinicians, academic instructors, clinical instructors, students, interns, residents and fellows regarding the best current practice of orthopaedic physical therapy

Overview of Project Methodology

James Irrgang PhD PT ATC Center for Sports Medicine University of Pittsburgh Medical Center and Department of Orthopaedic Surgery University of Pittsburgh





ICF Project Methodology

Workgroups:

- 7 workgroups established
- Each group has leader & 4 to 6 members with representation of individuals involved in clinical practice, research & education and a physician that can positively contribute to process.

7 Workgroups & Leaders:

- Foot & ankle T. McPoil
- Knee L. Snyder-Mackler
- Hip M. Cibulka & D. White
- Lumbosacral spine T. Delitto
- Cervicothoracic spine J. Childs & J. Cleland
- Shoulder P. McClure
- Elbow, wrist & hand J. McDermitt

ICF Project Methodology

5 Tasks:

- Identify M-S conditions that affect body region
- Identify common impairments of body structure & function, activity limitations & participation restrictions associated with each condition
- Describe system to classify individuals into homogeneous subsets that will best respond to specific interventions
- Describe interventions with supporting evidence for subsets of patients based upon classification system
- Summarize & disseminate guidelines

ICF Project Methodology

Identify M-S Conditions:

- Workgroup to identify 2 to 4 M-S conditions that affect region that are commonly managed by PTs
- Examples:
 - Hip fracture, OA, THA, labral tears
 - Foot & ankle plantar fasciitis, ankle sprains, Achilles tendinopaty
 - Shoulder adhesive capsulitis, impingement, rotator cuff tendinopathy

ICF Project Methodology

For Each Condition - Identify:

- Impairments in body structure & function
- Activity limitations
- Participation restriction

ICF Project Methodology

Example – Adhesive Capsulitis:

- Impairment of body structure:
 - Joint of shoulder region (s7200)
 - Ligaments & fasciae of shoulder region (s7204)
 - Muscles of shoulder region (s7203)

ICF Project Methodology

Example – Adhesive Capsulitis:

- Impairment of body function:
 - Pain in joints (b28016)
 - Pain in upper limb (b28014)Mobility of single joint (b7100)
 - Mobility of single joint (0/100)
 Mobility of several joints (b7101)
 - Mobility of scapula (b7200)
 - Power of isolated muscles & muscle groups (b7300)
 - Endurance of muscle groups (b7410)
 - Control of simple voluntary movements (b7600)
 - Control of complex voluntary movements (b7601)
 Coordination of voluntary movements (b7602)
 - Coordination of voluntary movements (b7602)

Example – Adhesive Capsulitis:

- Activity limitations & participation restrictions:
 - Lifting & carrying objects (d430):
 - Lifting (d4300)
 - Carrying in hands (d4301)
 - Carrying in arms (d4302)
 - Carrying on shoulders, hip or back (d4302)
 - Hand & arm use (d445)
 - Pulling (d4450)
 - Pushing (d4451)
 - Reaching (d4452)
 - Turning or twisting arms or hands (d4453)
 - Throwing (d4454)
 - Catching (d4455)

ICF Project Methodology

Example – Adhesive Capsulitis:

- Activity limitations & participation restrictions:
 - Washing oneself (d510)
 - Washing body parts (d510)
 - Washing whole body (d511)Drying oneself (d512)
 - Caring for body parts (d520)
 - Caring for body parts (d520)
 Caring for hair (d5202)
 - Toileting (d)
 - Dressing (d)
 - Putting on clothes (d5400)
 - Taking off clothes (d5401)
 - Eating (d550)
 - Drinking (d560)

ICF Project Methodology

Example – Adhesive Capsulitis:

- Activity limitations & participation restrictions:
 - Doing housework (d649)
 - Caring for household objects (d650)
 - Assisting others with self-care (d660)
 - Acquiring, keeping & terminating job (d845)
- Remunerative employment (d850)
- Community life (d910)
 Recreation & leisure (d920)
 - Play (d9200)
 - Sports (d9201)
 - Sports (d9201)
 Crafts (d9203)
 - Crafts (d9203)
 Hobbies (d9204)
 - Socializing (d9205)

ICF Project Methodology

- Impairments of body structure & function, activity limitation & participation restrictions are to be linked to the ICF
- Used to:
 - Classify patient (i.e. diagnose)
 - Establish prognosis (i.e. prognostic factors)
 - Measure outcome

ICF Project Methodology

Data Dictionary:

- Variable name
 - Type of variable
 - Definition
 - Measurement method
 - Nature of variable
 - Units of measurement
 - Measurement properties

ICF Project Methodology

Example – Shoulder Internal Rotation:

- Variable name passive internal rotation of shoulder
- Type of variable mobility of single joint
- Definition passive ROM of shoulder at 90⁰ of abduction in supine position
- Measurement method patient supine, end range passive IR with shoulder at 90° in frontal plane is measured with goniometer. Stationary arm aligned vertical. Moving arm aligned parallel to midline of arm at end range motion. Pressure applied to anterior aspect of shoulder to prevent scapular tipping
- Nature of variable continuous
- Units of measurement degrees
- Measurement properties inter-tester reliability in patients with variety of shoulder condition revealed ICC of .50 with SEM of 15° (Irrgang et al 2004)

Classification System:

- Use measures of impairment of body structure & function, activity limitations & participation restrictions to classify patients into homogeneous subsets that will respond to specific interventions
- Supported by evidence if no peer-reviewed evidence use collective clinical expertise to provide 1st approximation which then be the subject of further investigation
- Consider red flags identify patients that are: • Inappropriate for PT
 - Appropriate for PT but would benefit from consultation with another health care provider

ICF Project Methodology

Example – Adhesive Capsulitis:

- Acute condition at least 3 of the following:
 - VAS pain score at rest > 4
 - Pain at rest > 75% of time
 - Pain with active elevation of shoulder
 - Night pain or spasm end-feel
- Chronic condition defined as < 3 of above
 Corotto at al 200

Carette et al 2003

ICF Project Methodology

Interventions:

- Describe interventions & supporting evidence for specific subsets of patients within classification system
- Interventions typically focus on impairments

ICF Project Methodology

Example – Adhesive Capsulitis:

- Acute condition treated with:
 - Pain relieving modalities
 - Active ROM exercises within pain free ROM
- Chronic condition treated with:
 Stretching exercises
 - Joint mobilization

Carette et al 2003

ICF Project Methodology

Interventions:

- Focus is on interventions provided by PTs, but guidelines should also consider adjunctive procedures &/or pharmacological considerations
- For example guidelines for adhesive capsulitis should address considerations for intra-articular injection of corticosteroids

ICF Project Methodology

Evidence for Interventions:

- Greater emphasis given for clinical research involving patients
- If clinical evidence is lacking, evidence to support biological or biomechanical plausibility of evidence should be provided

Levels of Evidence - CEBM					
	Therapeutic Studies	Prognostic Studies	Diagnostic Studies		
Level I	High-quality randomized controlled trial with statistically significant difference or no statistically significant difference but narrow confidence intervals Systematic review ² of Lavel-1 randomized controlled trials (and study results were homogeneous ²)	High-quality prospective study ⁴ (all patients were enrolled at the same point in their disease with _90% follow-up of enrolled patients) Systematic review ² of Level-I studies	Testing of previously developed diagnostic criteria in series of consecutive patients (with universally applied reference "pold" standard) Systematic review ² of Level-1 studies		
Level II	Lesser-quality randomized controlist train [o.g., ex/50% follow- orp, no blinding, or improper randomization) Prospective ⁶ comparative study ⁵ Systematic review ⁶ of Level-II studies or Level-4 studies with inconsistent results	 Retrospective's study Untreated controls from a randomized controls from a randomized controls with the study (φ₀ = μ and the study (φ₀ = μ and the study (φ₀ = μ and the study for the study for the study for the study study for the study study for the study study for the study s	Development of diagnostic orbitris on basis of consecutive patients (with universally applied referenc 'gold' standard) Systematic review ² of Level-II studies		
Level III	Case-control study ⁷ Retrospective ⁶ comparative study ⁶ Systematic review ² of Level-III studies	Case-control study ²	Study of nonconsecutive patients (without consistently applied reference 'gold' standard) Systematic review ² of Level-III studies		
Level IV	Case series ⁸	Case series	Case-control study Poor reference standard		
Level V	Expert opinion	Expert opinion	Expert opinion		



Strength of Evidence:

- Strong supported by preponderance of Level I and II studies (including at least 1 Level I study). Includes clinical practice guidelines based on systematic reviews that include at least 1 Level I study
- Moderate supported by single Level I study or preponderance of Level II evidence
- Weak supported by single Level II study or preponderance of Level III and IV studies. Includes consensus expert opinion.

ICF Project Methodology

Strength of Evidence:

- Conflicting Evidence disagreement among high quality studies
- Theoretical/Foundational Evidence supported by preponderance of basic science research including animal studies, cadaveric studies and modeling



ICF Project Methodology

Summarize Results:

- Develop tools to support use of guidelines:
 - Data collection forms
 - Outcome instruments
 - Patient education material

Dissemination:

- Circulate to key stakeholders for review and comment
- Publish in peer reviewed journal - JOSPT