



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Nickels, M., Aitken, L. M., Barnett, A. G., Walsham, J. & McPhail, S. (2019). In-bed Cycling with Critically Ill Patients: Practical Lessons From a Randomised Trial. *Australian Critical Care*, 32(S1), S15-S16. doi: 10.1016/j.aucc.2018.11.054

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/21643/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2018.11.054>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

IN-BED CYCLING WITH CRITICALLY ILL PATIENTS: PRACTICAL LESSONS FROM A RANDOMISED TRIAL

Nickels M, Aitken L, Barnett A, Walsham J and McPhail S.

Introduction: In-bed cycling for critically ill patients is a rehabilitative exercise that may help improve patients' functional status at hospital discharge. In-bed cycling is not currently implemented early during a patients' critical illness. **Objectives:** To identify if early in-bed cycling could be safely implemented following a patients' admission to ICU and to identify the barriers and facilitators to implementation of in-bed cycling within ICU. **Methods:** A randomised controlled trial comparing usual care physiotherapy with additional in-bed cycling within a tertiary mixed medical, surgical, trauma ICU was conducted. Number of sessions of in-bed cycling planned, conducted, distance and duration cycled, haemodynamic parameters and occurrence of pre-defined adverse events were recorded. A diary of intervention implementation processes and outcomes was kept to identify barriers and facilitators to implementation of in-bed cycling. **Results:** Thirty-seven participants completed 276 of 304 (90.8%) planned in-bed cycling interventions. Participants completed a median (IQR) of 6 (4,8) in-bed cycling sessions. Participants commenced in-bed cycling a median (IQR) of 2.3 (1.8,3.1) days following ICU admission. Participants cycled a mean (SD) 27.7 (5.2) minutes per session and mean (SD) 3.23km (1.63km) per session and maintained haemodynamic stability. Two minor adverse events (0.7% of sessions) occurred that required clinician intervention (increased respiratory rate and oxygen desaturation). These events required adjustment to ventilator settings without any long-term consequences. The main barriers to the implementation of in-bed cycling sessions were patient fatigue (n=9), delirium (n=5) and haemodynamic instability (n=4). Timing of initiation of the intervention following morning chest x-ray round with independent implementation by a physiotherapist were identified as the main facilitators to the in-bed cycling intervention. **Conclusions:** In-bed cycling commencing within 2 to 3 days of a patients' ICU admission was both safe and feasible. Adverse events were rare and the main barrier to implementation of in-bed cycling sessions was patient fatigue.