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What is intermediate care?
An international consensus on what constitutes intermediate care is needed

Intermediate care is an emerging concept in health care, which may offer attractive alternatives to hospital care for elderly patients. As little scientific evidence exists on the benefits of intermediate care, research is especially important. A prerequisite for research is agreement on the definition of a concept, which is lacking for intermediate care. The term intermediate care is often used as if its meaning is clear, but it conveys little meaning other than being about care that is “in between.” Commonly used definitions of intermediate care do not help much, and several very different definitions are in use. What is needed at the outset is a consensus on what constitutes intermediate care. Until this is agreed on, the concept of intermediate care will remain a mirage and its possibilities unknown.

The term intermediate care was introduced in the United Kingdom’s NHS Plan and refined in the national service framework for older people. The concept seems to arise out of a policy imperative, rather than an analysis of the scientific evidence about effective models of care. Objectives such as “promotion of independence” and “prevention of unnecessary hospital admission” were to be achieved through providing a new range of services between hospital and home. Specific targets (for example, the number of service users, prevented admissions) accompanied these objectives. However, no particular models of service delivery were defined.

Professional statements of good practice followed the political decision that reconfiguration of the health service would include investment in intermediate forms of care. The British Geriatrics Society listed three definitions in its statement on intermediate care. The broadest definition is the one shared with the Royal College of Physicians of London, according to which intermediate care is delivered by those health services that do not require the resources of a general hospital but are beyond the scope of the traditional primary care team. Five of them (partly) focused on facilitating the transition from hospital to home. Other aims include avoidance of admission and improvement of pre-acute and post-acute care. A systematic review on the best place of care for older people after acute illness concluded that service models were best described in terms of the objectives of care.

Definitions from the databases Medline and CINAHL narrow intermediate care in the direction of nursing home care. For example, in Medline “intermediate care facilities” are institutions that provide health related care and services to individuals who do not require the degree of care which hospitals or skilled nursing facilities provide, but require care and services above the level of room and board. This probably results from the existence of intermediate care facilities in the United States and Japan, which closely resemble nursing homes. Further difficulty arises because individual authors also use the term intermediate care when describing a less advanced type of intensive care medicine.

This inventory of definitions shows that the term intermediate care currently does not present imply a specific, well defined type of health care (box). This worrying conclusion has important consequences. To compare results of research projects will be difficult if not impossible, as will be identifying gaps in our current knowledge or critically appraising the benefits attributed to intermediate care. These difficulties will only increase because of the growing popularity of intermediate care. Research is especially important.
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Definitions of intermediate care

British Geriatrics Society¹

- An approach to health care intended to facilitate patients’ transitions from illness to recovery, or to prevent their transition from home managed chronic impairment to institution-based dependence, or to help terminally ill people be as comfortable as possible at the end of their lives
- That range of services designed to facilitate transition from hospital to home, and from medical dependence to functional independence, where the objectives of care are not primarily medical, the patients’ discharge destination is anticipated, and a clinical outcome of recovery (or restoration of health) is desired
- Those services that do not require the resources of a general hospital, but are beyond the scope of the traditional primary care team. These can include “substitutional care” and “care for people with complex needs”
- (The last definition is the same as the one the Royal College of Physicians uses in its statement²)

Medical subject heading (MeSH)³

- Intermediate care facilities are institutions that provide health related care and services to individuals who do not require the degree of care that hospitals or skilled nursing facilities provide, but because of their physical or mental condition require care and services above the level of room and board

CINAHL subject headings

- Intermediate care (see subacute care) is care provided to acute care patients who are medically stable but too unstable to be treated in alternative healthcare settings such as home, ambulatory, or traditional skilled long term care
- Intermediate care facilities: entered here are materials on nursing home skilled long term care
- Intermediate care facilities: entered here are materials on nursing home skilled long term care

Guidelines for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

NICE guidelines are evidence based but will need regular updating

Faced with a plethora of guidelines, doctors in primary and secondary care may well ask, why another guideline and particularly a guideline for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and how is it going to affect practice?²

Guidelines from the Global Initiative in Obstructive Lung Disease were updated in 2003.¹ The National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) published a guideline earlier this year.³ New guidelines from the European Respiratory Society and American Thoracic Society appeared recently (www.thoracic.org/copd). The existence of so many guidelines reflects the increasing recognition of the burden of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease both on patients and on healthcare resources. Whereas the condition was considered to have few therapeutic options previously, it is now considered treatable, and over the past five years increasing evidence supports pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatments. This article discusses the guideline published for NICE by the National Collaborating Centre for Chronic Conditions and many members of the British Thoracic Society and makes some comparisons with other guidelines. The 1997 British Thoracic Society guidelines needed updating,⁴ which is what the NICE guideline does. It is truly evidence based, wide ranging, and deals with diagnosis, assessment of severity, and treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

The evidence on which the recommendations in the NICE guideline are based is presented in a standard format for each section, indicating which studies were reviewed, with evidence based statements
