Selection Bias May Influence Who Is Offered Cardiac Rehabilitation
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Abstract:
The clinical benefits of cardiac rehabilitation (CR) are well established, however, participation remains low across many countries. The purpose of this study was to characterize differences in the CR program among those eligible to participate and to identify factors associated with enrollment in the CR program. This was followed by the influence of a support person, offering the program in a cardiologist’s office, the use of materials, and the patient age (older patients were more likely to enroll to CR) (see Table 3).

Methods:
• Respondents from the 2010–2012 United States National Health and Wellness Survey (NHWS), a nationwide health=nume survey, were reassigned to participate in a follow-up survey as a way to address the limitations of a cross-sectional study.

• Participation rates remain low. This study was undertaken to describe the differences in patient characteristics and perceptions among eligible patients who were offered and enrolled in a cardiac rehabilitation program.

• The results suggest that certain patients, particularly those with a poorer health profile and more financial and supportive resources, may be more likely to be offered a CR program. Who receives CR and how it is delivered should therefore be considered.

• The CR program should be made more available to those who were offered the program.

• Adjusted probability of enrolling in a CR program for select subgroups (see Figure 2).

• Limitations: The study was not powered to detect small differences in outcomes. Additional variables were not included in the study may help to explain the observed associations and the reported relationships should not be interpreted as causal. Although the broader sample source of NHWS is nationally representative, this specific study relied upon a convenience sample.

• Conclusions:

• Selection bias: JHI.

• Limitations: The study was not powered to detect small differences in outcomes.

• Additional variables were not included in the study.

• The results support that certain patients, particularly those with a poorer health profile and more financial and supportive resources, may be more likely to be offered a CR program.

• The study was not powered to detect small differences in outcomes. Additional variables were not included in the study.

• The results support that certain patients, particularly those with a poorer health profile and more financial and supportive resources, may be more likely to be offered a CR program.