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“Sometimes when I consider what tremendous consequences come from little things, I am tempted to think there are no little things.”

Bruce Barton
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CHAPTER 01
GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND OUTLINE OF THIS THESIS
**PARKINSON’S DISEASE**

Parkinson’s disease (PD) is a progressive neurodegenerative disorder. The prevalence is estimated to be about 1.3% to 1.5% for persons above the age of 60 years in Europe. The number of individuals with PD will have doubled by the year 2030. PD results from an accelerated loss of dopamine-producing cells in the substantia nigra, a sentinel node in the basal ganglia circuitry. The resultant dopamine depletion leads to a number of typical motor features. During life the diagnosis of PD is clinically based, but the ultimate confirmation of the PD diagnosis requires neuropathological investigations. The presence of typical motor features (asymmetrical resting tremor, bradykinesia, or both), often in combination with rigidity and postural instability, exclusionary symptoms, and response to levodopa is required to meet established clinical criteria. Some additional clinical features and auxiliary investigations allow, to a larger extent, a differentiation between PD and the closely related forms of atypical parkinsonism. Besides these motor symptoms, PD is also characterized by a wide variety of non-motor symptoms such as depression, fatigue, autonomic dysfunction, cognitive decline, and sleep disturbances. Non-motor symptoms generally correlate with advancing age and disease severity, although some of these (most notably constipation, insomnia and REM sleep behavior disorder) can occur early in the course of the disease, or might even become manifest before the motor symptoms. PD is a complex and thereby incapacitating disease. As a result, many PD patients carry a relatively heavy illness burden in the physical, mental and social dimensions of health-related quality of life compared with many other neurological or chronic conditions.

**MANAGEMENT OF PD**

Currently, there is no cure for PD. The treatment of PD is therefore symptomatic, and primarily involves dopaminergic medication. Deep brain surgery is an alternative, but this is only available for a selective group of patients whose symptoms are dopamine responsive but who experience debilitating response fluctuations. There is also a wide variety of non-pharmacological treatment options, including physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech and language therapy. The evidence to support these interventions is gradually growing, and treatment guidelines (partially based on evidence, partially on practical clinical experience) for some of these allied healthcare interventions have been developed. Integrating these various treatment options into a bundled multidisciplinary approach (along with pharmacological and surgical treatment) is widely felt to represent an optimal therapeutic strategy for this complex, multifaceted disease.

**PHYSICAL INACTIVITY**

Many patients with PD lead a sedentary lifestyle. Overall, PD patients are 29% less physically active in comparison with age-matched controls. This reduced level of physical activity is particularly observed in patients with advanced disease. The motor and non-motor features of PD contribute directly or indirectly to this sedentary lifestyle. Being physically inactive is likely to have deleterious consequences for PD patients, for various reasons. A sedentary lifestyle is one of the leading causes of death among individuals in the general population and is associated with an increase in all-cause mortality. Lower levels of physical activity are a modifiable risk factor for several chronic diseases like type 2 diabetes mellitus, cancer, obesity, hypertension, bone and joint disease (osteoarthritis and osteoporosis), and depression. Furthermore, physical inactivity could increase the risk of cardiovascular disease directly. In one study, three weeks of bed rest caused a greater deterioration in cardiovascular and physical working capacity than did 30 years of aging. Finally, the sedentary lifestyle of PD patients could lead to a worsening of specific symptoms that are already present because of the disease itself; examples include insomnia, constipation, and depression.

**REASONS WHY PARKINSON PATIENTS SHOULD BECOME MORE ACTIVE**

Patients with PD have many reasons to become (more) physically active. In general, physical activity reduces the risk of cardiovascular disease, cancer and osteoporosis. Physical activity could also have potential disease-specific effects, for example by improving cognitive dysfunction and mood. Animal studies indicate that exercise can prevent and decelerate the development of experimental parkinsonism through several mechanisms that involve neural plasticity of the dopaminergic and glutamatergic system. This is further supported by studies that investigated the relationship between physical activity and the risk of developing PD in humans, which have shown that moderate to vigorous exercise may protect against later development

---

* In the Netherlands, the content of the evidence-based guideline for physiotherapy in PD is identical to the guidelines for Cesar exercise therapists and Mensendieck exercise therapists. Therefore, the term ‘physiotherapy’ also includes Cesar and Mensendieck exercise therapies.
of PD. Increasing physical activity in PD could also have some risks. PD patients have an increased risk of falls and fall-related injuries. In the general population, more active men and women have a higher incidence rate of leisure time and sport-related injuries than less active adults. Furthermore, exercise is associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular complications. However, compared to sedentary counterparts and those with low aerobic fitness, physically active or aerobically fit individuals have 25% to 50% lower overall risk of developing cardiovascular disease.

THE CHALLENGE OF BEHAVIORAL CHANGE

Although virtually everyone appreciates the potential merits of exercise, simply informing subjects about such health benefits is not enough to change their behavior and to reach a sustained healthy lifestyle. Apparently, it is very difficult for people to give up their unhealthy behavior. Even patients who developed lifestyle-related illnesses, such as diabetes, have a hard time to reverse their unhealthy lifestyle. A real and sustained behavioral change is needed to achieve a physically active lifestyle for longer periods of time. In PD patients, several specific barriers exist to become and remain physically active, such as their motor symptoms (gait and balance problems) and non-motor symptoms (like apathy, fatigue, depression, and cognitive dysfunction).

To change a sedentary lifestyle into an active lifestyle for longer periods of time, it is necessary to identify and overcome these barriers to physical activity. One possible solution is that PD patients might benefit from receiving specific coaching and counseling when attempting to increase their levels of physical activity.

There are several theories about exercise behavior, including the health belief model, the social cognitive theory, and the transtheoretical model. Evidence shows that physical activity interventions should be targeted at several principles of behavioral change. Major factors to ascertain a sustained behavioral change include: social support from family and friends; self-efficacy; an individually tailored program; activities that reflect the person’s preferences and capabilities (as these contribute to greater adherence); goal setting, using for example a health contract; regular performance feedback; and positive reinforcement.
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CHAPTER

HOW MIGHT PHYSICAL ACTIVITY BENEFIT PATIENTS WITH PARKINSON’S DISEASE?

NATURE REVIEW NEUROLOGY, 2011;7(9): 528-534
Arlène D. Speelman, Bart P. van de Warrenburg, Marlies van Nimwegen, Giselle M. Petzinger, Marten Munneke and Bastiaan R. Bloem
ABSTRACT
PD is a neurodegenerative disorder characterized by progressive motor and nonmotor impairments. These impairments incline many patients towards a sedentary lifestyle, which has many deleterious consequences. Accumulating evidence suggests that patients with PD might benefit from physical activity and exercise in a number of ways, from general improvements in health to disease-specific effects and, potentially, disease-modifying effects (suggested by animal data). Many issues remain to be addressed, including the need to perform clinical trials to demonstrate these presumed benefits of physical activity and exercise in patients with PD. These trials must also address safety issues, such as an increased risk of falls and cardiovascular complications in more-active patients. Identifying ways to induce a sustained behavioral change, using specifically tailored programs that address potential barriers such as depression, apathy and postural instability, may lead to an improved quality of life in individuals with PD.

INTRODUCTION
PD is a neurodegenerative condition characterized by progressive motor symptoms, including gait disturbances and balance instability. Patients with PD can also develop a range of nonmotor complications, such as depression, apathy, sleep disturbances, constipation, and cognitive dysfunction. Together, these motor and nonmotor impairments might encourage the individual to adopt a sedentary lifestyle. This response creates a vicious circle, because physical inactivity can negatively affect several clinical domains of PD (Figure 2.1).

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF EXERCISE
IMPROVING COGNITIVE FUNCTION
Cognitive impairment is common in individuals in the advanced stages of PD (up to 80% of patients will eventually develop dementia), and findings from the past 5–6 years suggest that cognitive decline actually begins early in the course of disease. Only two small studies have investigated the benefits of an aerobic exercise program on cognitive dysfunction in patients with PD. One of these studies investigated the effects of a multimodal physical exercise program in 20 patients with PD. The participants were assigned to either an intervention group (who received general physical training for 6 months) or a control group. The results showed a beneficial effect of training on executive function. The other study evaluated the benefits of exercise in 28 patients with PD, who were allocated to either an intervention program of twice-weekly exercise for 12 weeks or a control group. The researchers concluded that exercise had
selective benefits on cognitive functioning by improving frontal-lobe-based executive function.\textsuperscript{50} Additional evidence from studies in elderly individuals and patients with Alzheimer disease suggests that exercise may postpone cognitive deterioration\textsuperscript{22} and delay the onset of dementia.\textsuperscript{23} The aerobic component of exercise, in particular, drives these clinical effects.\textsuperscript{23} These promising results should now be explored further in large trials of exercise in patients with PD.

**ARREST OF OSTEOPOROSIS**

The prevalence of osteoporosis is high in patients with PD: up to 63% of women with PD and 20% of men with PD have this condition.\textsuperscript{52,53} By comparison, in age-matched healthy populations the prevalence of osteoporosis is 29% in women and 12% in men.\textsuperscript{14} Several factors might contribute to accelerated bone loss in patients with PD, such as physical inactivity, vitamin D...
The American College

In a small, non-controlled study of 20 patients with PD, although the causes of constipation in patients with PD are multi-factorial, this symptom is in part attributable to a lack of physical exercise. Prospective studies have yet evaluated the influence of exercise or increased physical activity on constipation in patients with PD, however, we might reasonably expect that patients with PD would experience similar benefits to those seen in healthy individuals, in whom cross-sectional studies have shown an inverse relationship between physical activity and the risk of constipation. The mechanisms underlying the positive effect of exercise on constipation are unclear, but could include increased colorectal motility, decreased blood flow to the gut, biomechanical stimulation of the gut during bouncing movements (such as running) or compression of the colon by abdominal musculature, and increased fiber intake as a result of increased energy expenditure.
DECREASED FATIGUE

Fatigue is experienced by 30–50% of patients with PD, and in a community-based population study, 44.2% of 233 patients with PD reported fatigue, compared with 18% of 100 age-matched controls. Longitudinal studies in the general population showed that the amount of physical activity undertaken was inversely correlated with the presence of fatigue. This pattern was also apparent in patients with PD. Results obtained from studies in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome showed that cognitive behavioral training effectively reduced fatigue; however, changes in physical activity did not reduce levels of fatigue. A review of nine randomized controlled trials found encouraging evidence that patients with chronic fatigue syndrome benefit from exercise therapy, but also concluded that more studies are needed. If these findings can be extrapolated to patients with PD, exercise training in patients with PD might be useful to avoid or reduce fatigue in this population, although there no data have been obtained from clinical trials to support this hypothesis. The other side of the coin is that exercise may paradoxically increase fatigue, so future trials should tailor the level of exercise to each patient’s individual capacity.

IMPROVED MOTOR PERFORMANCE

Individuals with PD invariably experience functional decline in a number of motor domains, including posture, balance, gait, and transfers (such as moving between a bed and chair). Several studies, including systematic reviews and a meta-analysis, have evaluated the effects of exercise on these functional deficits (Table 2.1). The overall conclusions of these studies were that exercise can improve physical functioning, health-related quality of life, leg strength, balance, posture, gait, and physical condition. The data showing that exercise improves functional motor performance in patients with PD seem robust; however, the question remains as to which exercise protocol is best suited for individual patients.

IMPROVED LEVODOPA EFFICACY

Several studies have investigated the association between exercise and the pharmacokinetics of levodopa, one of the drugs most commonly used to treat the symptoms of PD. Levodopa is transported to the brain and converted to dopamine, which ameliorates the dopamine deficit that occurs in patients with PD. Although most studies have found no effect of exercise on the efficacy of levodopa, one report revealed a trend towards improved absorption of this drug during physical activity. In theory, exercise might stimulate levodopa absorption because of accelerated gastric passage or increased mesenteric blood flow. Alternatively, levodopa might cross the blood–brain barrier more efficiently, due to higher blood pressure and heart rate during exercise. However, these prior studies only evaluated a single, brief bout of exercise (maximum 2 h). Clearly, further studies are needed, particularly of prolonged exercise interventions, to assess the effect of exercise on the response to levodopa therapy in individuals with PD.

OPTIMIZED DOPAMINERGIC SIGNALING

Exercise could potentially influence endogenous production and release of dopamine in patients with PD, leading to enhanced dopaminergic neurotransmission. This postulated mechanism is in line with behavioral studies that reported a positive effect of endurance exercise on both simple and more-complex movements in patients with PD, both of which were executed faster after exercise. Although no concurrent neuroimaging studies were performed, the authors speculated that this improved performance could be attributed to an augmented synthesis and release of dopamine and other catecholamines in the prefrontal cortex, nucleus accumbens and basal ganglia. However, some researchers have expressed concern that, when exercising, the motor response of PD patients may be pushed towards more normal values and the motor system might use up the available levodopa faster, leading to a greater (or earlier) dopamine shortage in the hours following exercise. This hypothesis needs to be studied in detail.

PREVENTION OF PD

The preceding section dealt with how exercise might improve motor and nonmotor dysfunction in patients who have clinically overt PD. However, the fascinating possibility exists that physical activity or exercise could also postpone the onset of parkinsonism, or perhaps even prevent disease manifestations altogether, in asymptomatic individuals who are predisposed to develop

BOX 3

THE PARKFIT STUDY

Our research group designed the ParkFit program—a multifaceted intervention to promote physical activity in sedentary patients with PD. This intervention is being studied in the ParkFit trial, which will investigate whether this program affords increased levels of physical activity that persist for 2 years. The trial will also evaluate the possible health benefits and risks of increased physical activity. The ParkFit trial is a multicenter, randomized controlled trial that will compare two different exercise interventions: physical therapy with a specific emphasis on promoting a physically active lifestyle (the ParkFit program); and matched physical therapy with a specific emphasis on the safety and quality of performing daily activities (the ParkSafe program). The ParkFit program emphasizes behavioral change, using a combination of accepted motivational techniques and strategies, and personal health coaches to induce a lasting increase in exercise behavior for patients with PD. The ParkFit program incorporates several specific elements: an educational workbook (including a health contract and logbook) designed to educate the patient about the benefits of physical activity, provide advice about suitable activities, help to identify and overcome perceived barriers to engagement in physical activity, and provide information on recruiting social support; a personal activity coach; goal setting; ambulatory monitoring with visual feedback; and physical therapy. The first results of the trial are expected by the end of 2011.
how might physical activity benefit patients with parkinson’s disease?

The holy grail in the field of PD is to reliably identify these individuals as early as possible and to expose them to treatments that might slow down, or even arrest, the underlying disease process that will ultimately result in parkinsonism. Although such pre-emptive treatments are not yet available, we may logically assume that exercise could prove to be an intervention. This idea is further supported by epidemiological studies that investigated the relationship between physical activity and the risk of subsequently developing PD, and by studies in mice models of PD that have highlighted the neuroprotective and neurorestorative effects of exercise. However, whether the association between exercise and risk of PD can be explained by a truly preventive effect of exercise on the development of PD, or by a decrease in baseline recreational activity as a result of preclinical PD, is not yet clear.

RISKS OF EXERCISE IN PD

Individuals with PD have an increased risk of falls and fall-related injuries, such as fractures. The rates for falls and injuries might increase still further if these patients are stimulated to become more active, as even in the general population physically active adults have a higher incidence of leisure-time and sport-related injuries than their less active counterparts. In patients with PD, fall rates seem to taper off in the end stages of the disease, as the patients become progressively less mobile.

Paradoxically, although exercise may increase the likelihood of falls in individuals with PD, it could also reduce the overall risk associated with falls and the associated fractures; for example, by improving strength, fitness, bone density or overall balance. One study investigated the effects of a home-based exercise program in patients with PD. The results suggested that this intervention tended to reduce the incidence of fall events and injurious falls. Additional evidence came from the RESCUE study—a large, multicenter study of rhythmic somatosensory cueing, in which a vibrating cylinder attached to the wrist was used to improve gait in patients with PD. The researchers reported that the intervention led to improved mobility without an increased risk of falls. The case as to whether exercise increases the patient’s risk of falling is, therefore, far from closed; moreover, this issue should be considered in future trials.

Exercise is also associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular complications. Although the risk of sudden cardiac arrest or myocardial infarction is very low in generally healthy adults during activities of moderate intensity, the risk of these events increases during vigorous physical activity, especially in sedentary individuals or those with pre-existing coronary artery disease. Nonetheless, physically active or aerobically fit individuals enjoy a 25–50% reduction in their lifetime overall risk of developing cardiovascular disease. Comparable data are not available for patients with PD, but they are unlikely to be an exception to this general rule. However, the risk of comorbid cerebrovascular disease seems to be higher in patients with PD than in the general population. This increased risk is likely ameliorated by exercise, because regular moderate exercise has been shown to be a protective factor for development of cerebrovascular disease. Other potential adverse effects of exercise include increased fatigue and levodopa requirements, as discussed earlier.

BOX 4

**EVIDENCE FROM ANIMAL STUDIES**

In rodent models of PD, which rely on administration of neurotoxins (6-OHDA or MPTP) to induce parkinsonian symptoms, exercise attenuates the degree of injury to midbrain dopaminergic neuron, and restores basal ganglia function through adaptive mechanisms of dopamine and glutamate neurotransmission. In rats, voluntary or forced exercise (on a running wheel or treadmill) initiated before or during the administration of 6-OHDA and continued for an additional 1–5 weeks afterwards leads to the preservation of neurons in the substantia nigra pars compacta and to the attenuation of terminal loss in striatal and nigrostriatal dopaminergic neurons. Similarly, intensive treadmill exercise facilitates brain recovery in MPTP-treated mice, even when exercise commenced after neurotoxin-induced cell death was complete. These animals also demonstrated compensatory changes in the remaining dopaminergic neurons, such as altered dopamine handling (increased release and decreased uptake) and neurotransmission (increased dopamine numbers of D2 receptors expression) in surviving dopaminergic neurons and their targets.

Exercise may also reverse the increased glutamatergic drive characteristic of the parkinsonian state at the level of striatal medium spiny neurons, by modulating the subunit composition of α-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxazolepropionic acid receptors (a glutamate receptors subtype), and by diminishing the amplitude of the spontaneous excitatory post-synaptic potential at glutamatergic corticostriatal terminals. Several potential exercise-induced mechanisms of neuroprotection and neurorestoration exist at the cellular level: elevation of transcription factors; activation of signal transduction pathways; and the induction of neurotrophic factors, such as brain-derived neurotrophin and glia-derived neurotrophin.

Abbreviations: 6-OHDA, 6-hydroxydopamine; MPTP, 1-methyl-4-phenyl-1,2,3,6-tetrahydrodipyridine.
TABLE 2.1
SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED REVIEWS ON THE EFFECT OF EXERCISE ON MOTOR DISABILITY IN PD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Numbers of RCTs</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Criteria for Inclusion</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin et al. (2006)**</td>
<td>Exercise or physical activity</td>
<td>14 RCTs</td>
<td>495 patients with PD</td>
<td>Exercise is effective at improving physical functioning, HRQOL, leg strength, balance and walking. Insufficient evidence that exercise improves falls and depression.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crizzle et al. (2006)**</td>
<td>Physical or therapeutic exercise</td>
<td>7 studies</td>
<td>438 patients with PD</td>
<td>Interventions comprising physical or therapeutic exercise. Effects of physical exercise were evaluated. Published in a peer-reviewed journal.</td>
<td>Patients improve physical performance and activities of daily living through exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosa et al. (2007)**</td>
<td>Physical therapy</td>
<td>29 studies</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Physical therapy. Only trials with sufficient data. Core areas of physical therapy. Published in English, Dutch or German.</td>
<td>Four specific recommendations: cueing strategies to improve gait; cognitive movement strategies to improve transfer; exercises to improve balance; training of joint mobility and muscle power to improve physical capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwakkel et al. (2007)**</td>
<td>Physical therapy</td>
<td>23 RCTs</td>
<td>1,063 patients with PD</td>
<td>Core areas of physical therapy. Published in English, German or Dutch.</td>
<td>Evidence in favor of specific task-oriented exercise training to improve posture, balance control, gait and gait-related activities, and physical condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehrhadi et al. (2010)**</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>8 RCTs</td>
<td>203 patients with PD</td>
<td>Treadmill training versus no treadmill training.</td>
<td>Patients who receive treadmill training are more likely than those who do not to improve their impaired gait hypokinesia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Meta-analysis. †UK Brain bank criteria. Abbreviations: HRQOL, health-related quality of life; PD, Parkinson disease; RCT, randomized controlled trial.

CHANGING SEDENTARY LIFESTYLES

Regular physical activity is commonly accepted to be an important component of a healthy lifestyle. However, simply informing people about the health benefits of physical activity is not enough to attain a sustained behavioral change, which might explain why so many citizens (not just patients with PD) lead a sedentary life. Inducing a lasting change in exercise behaviors offers a particularly great challenge for patients with neurological disorders. In patients with PD, several specific barriers to such changes exist—not only the motor disabilities (gait and balance problems), but also the diverse nonmotor problems (cognitive decline, apathy, and depression). The progressive nature of these symptoms provides reasons to doubt whether patients with PD can be motivated to remain active in the long term.

If a true behavioral change can be attained in patients with PD, they might need specific coaching and counseling (rather than the general advice given to healthy adults). Evidence shows that effective physical activity interventions in this group should incorporate behavioral change principles. Social cognitive theories propose that the control of behavior is based on two types of expectations: self-efficacy (individuals’ belief in their ability to perform actions to attain a desired outcome) and outcome expectations (the belief that a certain consequence will be produced by personal action). To change lifestyle and attain an enduring behavioral shift might, therefore, call for specific strategies tailored to the individual’s preferences and needs. These behavioral programs should focus on appropriate supervision and social support from spouses and caregivers. Our research group has begun to address these issues in the ParkFit study (Box 3). Further research is needed to develop combined counseling and exercise programs for patients with PD, which focus on a behavioral change and have long-term follow-up. So far, the available studies have had no postintervention exercise-free period, and only short follow-up. Extended follow-up is important to evaluate whether the beneficial effects of exercise persist, and whether a reduced-intensity maintenance exercise program is needed to uphold the effects. Other studies should try to separate symptomatic effects from potential disease-modifying effects.

CONCLUSIONS

Compelling theoretical reasons support the avoidance of a sedentary lifestyle and the promotion of physical activity (including muscle strengthening, aerobic exercise and weight-bearing exercise) for people with, or at risk of developing, PD. Currently, however, we lack adequate knowledge about the merits of exercise specifically in patients with PD. The best available evidence stems from studies in healthy individuals or patients with other neurodegenerative diseases, which suggest a beneficial effect of exercise on cardiovascular mortality or morbidity and on cognitive dysfunction or mood. Animal studies have raised the fascinating possibility that exercise might exert a neuroprotective effect in experimentally induced parkinsonism (Box 2).
4) but these findings have yet to be translated to the human disease. Development of a reliable strategy to stimulate an active lifestyle in patients with PD will be essential, and these efforts must pay careful attention to safety issues and each patient’s individual capacities. Such exercise programs must also consider various barriers that could impede an active lifestyle specifically in patients with PD, such as apathy, fatigue, depression and cognitive dysfunction. The primary aim of these approaches is to induce a sustained behavioral change, with the hope of providing symptomatic relief of both motor and nonmotor disability, and perhaps to slow down progression in patients with overt PD. If exercise is proven to have disease-modifying effects, the ultimate goal will be to deliver strategies to postpone, or possibly prevent, the first disease manifestations in asymptomatic populations at risk of developing PD.
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BONE MINERAL DENSITY AND VITAMIN D STATUS IN PARKINSON’S DISEASE PATIENTS

JOURNAL OF NEUROLOGY 2012; IN PRESS
Frederiek van den Bos, Arlène D. Speelman, Marlies van Nimwegen, Yvonne T. van der Schouw, Frank J.G. Backx, Bastiaan R. Bloem, Marten Munneke, Harald J.J. Verhaar
ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND
Bone loss is more common in PD than in the general population. Several factors may be involved in the development of bone loss, including malnutrition, immobilization, low body mass index, decreased muscle strength, vitamin D deficiency and medication use. This study investigates the prevalence of osteoporosis and possible risk factors associated with bone loss in early stage PD.

METHODS
In 186 PD patients (Hoehn and Yahr stage 1 - 2.5, mean age 64.1 years, 71% men) bone mineral density (BMD) measurements were performed with DEXA. T- and Z-scores were calculated. Univariate linear regression analysis was performed to identify variables that contributed to BMD. 25-OH-vitamin D status of PD patients was compared with 802 controls (mean age 63.3 years, 50% men) using linear regression analysis.

RESULTS
Osteoporosis (11.8%) and osteopenia (41.4%) were common in PD patients. Mean Z-score for the hip was 0.24 (SD 0.93), and for the lumbar spine 0.72 (SD 1.91). Female gender, low weight, and low 25-OH-vitamin D were significantly correlated with BMD of the hip and lumbar spine. PD patients had lower 25(OH)D serum levels than controls (B=-10, p=0.000).

CONCLUSION
More than half of the patients with early stage PD had an abnormal BMD. Female gender, low weight, and low vitamin D concentration were associated with bone loss. Furthermore, vitamin D concentrations were reduced in PD patients. These results underscore the importance of proactive screening for bone loss and vitamin D deficiency, even in early stages of PD.
QDR1000. Scanning was performed according to the instructions of the manufacturer. Quality assurance, including calibration was performed routinely every morning for DEXA, using the standard provided by the manufacturer. BMD was measured at the femoral neck, trochanteric and intertrochanteric regions and in the first four lumbar vertebrae. The difference between an individual’s BMD and the mean for a reference population is expressed in standard deviation (SD) units. T- and Z-scores were calculated where the T-score is the SD of the individual BMD compared with the mean BMD score in a young healthy population and the Z-score is the SD of the individual BMD compared to the mean BMD score of a similar sex-, age-, weight- and height-matched population. We used the WHO classification range to categorize subjects as normal (T>-1), osteopenic (-2.5 < T ≤ -1), or osteoporotic (T ≤ -2.5).

Physical activity
The level of physical activity was measured with a 7-day recall, based on a interview-based physical activity questionnaire, the LASA Physical Activity Questionnaire (LAPAQ). Patients were asked to list their daily amount of activity (frequency and duration), so total time spent on physical activity (in hours per week) could be calculated.

Isometric grip strength
Isometric grip strength was measured using an adjustable hand held dynamometer (JAMAR dynamometer) at the non-dominant hand. The subjects were seated with their shoulder adducted and neutrally rotated. The dynamometer was held freely, without support. The elbow was flexed at 90° and care was taken that it did not touch the trunk. The forearm was in a neutral position, and the wrist was held between 0-30° dorsiflexion and between 0-15° ulnar deviation. The subjects were told to put maximal force on the dynamometer. The maximal value of two trials was noted in kilograms.

Body composition
Height and weight were measured in standing position without shoes. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as the weight in kilograms divides by the square of heights in meters.

Other variables
A wide range of other variables was assessed: disease severity (Hoehn and Yahr staging); motor section of the Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS); disease duration (date of diagnosis); mobility (Timed Up and Go test (TUG)) and gait speed (participants were timed while walking four meters at their normal pace).

Participants were asked about current and past medication use. All participants were interviewed about their smoking and alcohol habits. The participants were asked to complete questionnaires about diet and sunlight exposure. The mean weekly dietary calcium and vitamin D intake was calculated for each participant. Furthermore, serum samples of both calcium and vitamin D were measured. Since low levels of testosterone have been shown to have a detrimental effect on bone density in men we analyzed if testosterone levels were related to bone density. All patients were measured on dopaminergic medication.

25-OH-vitamin D
25-OH vitamin D (25(OH)D) levels were measured on the E170 modular (Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany) and compared with a reference group. The reference group consisted of 402 independently living women and 400 independently living men. Their mean age was 63.3 years (range 40-80). Vitamin D deficiency was defined as a 25(OH)D level of less than 50 nmol/l.

X-rays
X-ray radiographics of the spine and thoracal vertebrae were performed to assess vertebral compression fractures.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
Bivariate associations were determined using the chi-square test for categorical variables and the unpaired t-test for continuous variables. Univariate linear regression analysis was performed to study the association between the several factors mentioned above and BMD. Age, gender, height and weight were included in the analysis, as these factors may influence BMD. Linear regression analysis was used to investigate the 25(OH)D concentration between patients and controls after controlling for covariates age, gender, weight, height, smoking and alcohol consumption. A significant level of 0.05 was set for all statistical tests.
RESULTS

Of the 586 PD patients included in the ParkFit study, 186 PD patients participated in the present study (Table 3.1). Characteristics of the PD patients in the ParkFit study and PD patients of the present study are presented in Table 3.2.

BONE MINERAL DENSITY IN PD

The summed prevalence of osteoporosis and osteopenia was 53.2% (41.4% for osteopenia, 11.8% for osteoporosis) in PD patients (Table 3.3). The mean Z-score for the hip was 0.24, and for the lumbar spine 0.72.

DETERMINANTS OF BMD

Univariate regression analyses showed that female gender, low weight and low 25-OH-vitamine D were significantly correlated with BMD of the hip and lumbar spine (Table 3.4). Physical activity and isometric grip strength were also correlated with the BMD of the hip. No relationships between other factors and BMD were present. Multivariate regression analysis showed that the BMD of the hip and lumbar spine were related to female gender, low weight and low 25-OH-vitamine D (Table 3.5).

25 (OH) D CONCENTRATION PD VERSUS CONTROLS

In PD patients 56.2% had a vitamin D deficiency (mean vitamin D concentration 48.3 nmol/l) compared to 43.2% in the control groups (mean 56.7 nmol/l) (Table 3.1). 25(OH)D vitamin D serum levels were significantly lower in PD compared to controls (difference = -10.2 nmol/l, p<0.000). A higher portion of the samples were drawn in the winter to spring (when vitamin D levels are lower). The portion of samples drawn in the winter to spring were significantly lower than the portion drawn in the summer to fall (43.4 nmol/l vs. 58.8 nmol/l, p<0.00), but these seasonal differences had no influence on the regression analyses we performed.

TESTOSTERONE LEVELS

Regression analysis showed that testosterone levels have no significant relationship with BMD of the hip and lumbar spine (Hip: B=0.000, p=0.820; Lumbar spine: B=0.001, p=0.781).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PD patients (n=186)</th>
<th>Control group (n=802)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>64.1 (7.7)</td>
<td>63.3 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (%)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>80 (13.1)</td>
<td>76.8 (13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>173.8 (8.6)</td>
<td>170.9 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>27.2 (4)</td>
<td>26.2 (3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitamin D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-OH-vitamin D nmol/l</td>
<td>48.3 (20.2)</td>
<td>56.7 (22.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-OH-vitamin D % insufficiency</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PD characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration (years)</td>
<td>4.9 (4.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>31.9 (9.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 1.5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 2</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 2.5</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of physical activity (hours/week)</td>
<td>12.2 (8 to 20.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular (&gt;3 times a week going outside)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect mean (SD), percentage or median (IQ-range). PD=Parkinson’s disease, BMI = Body Mass Index, UPDRS III= unified Parkinson’s disease rating scale part III, HY= Hoehn and Yahr stage.
TABLE 3.2
CHARACTERISTICS OF PATIENTS OF THE PARKFIT STUDY AND SUBGROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Participants without DEXA (n=400)</th>
<th>Participants with DEXA (n=186)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>65.8 (7.7)</td>
<td>64.8 (7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%men)</td>
<td>62.5% (n=250)</td>
<td>71% (n=132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>81.1 (15.4)</td>
<td>82.0 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>171.0 (10.3)</td>
<td>173.8 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>27.7 (4.3)</td>
<td>27.2 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration (years)</td>
<td>5.4 (4.7)</td>
<td>4.9 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>33.5 (11.0)</td>
<td>31.0 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 1.5</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 2</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 2.5</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect mean (SD), percentage or median (IQR-range). PD=Parkinson’s disease, BMI = Body Mass Index, UPDRS III= unified Parkinson’s disease rating scale part III, HY= Hoehn and Yahr stage.

TABLE 3.3
BONE MINERAL DENSITY IN PARKINSON’S DISEASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PD patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osteoporosis/osteopenia (%)</td>
<td>98 (53.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal bone mineral density</td>
<td>88 (46.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMD total hip g/cm²</td>
<td>0.94 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMD lumbar spine g/cm²</td>
<td>1.06 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-score hip right</td>
<td>0.25 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-score hip left</td>
<td>0.22 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-score lumbar spine</td>
<td>0.72 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect mean (sd) or number (percentage %) BMD = Bone Mineral Density, PD = Parkinson’s Disease.

TABLE 3.4
UNIVARIATE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BMD LUMBAR SPINE AND HIP TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>BMD Lumbar Spine B (SE)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>BMD Hip total B (SE)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.001 (0.002); p=0.551</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.001 (0.001); p=0.471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>0.006 (0.001); p=0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004 (0.001); p=0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.087 (0.033); p=0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.107 (0.020); p=0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-OH-Vitamin-D</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001); p=0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001 (0.001); p=0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.019); p=0.501</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.031 (0.012); p=0.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>-0.069 (0.056); p=0.216</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.045 (0.035); p=0.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>0.004 (0.005); p=0.389</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.005 (0.003); p=0.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isometric grip strength</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001); p=0.152</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001 (0.000); p=0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levodopa use</td>
<td>-0.075 (0.035); p=0.322</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.014 (0.023); p=0.541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homocystein</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.003); p=0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.002 (0.002); p=0.265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testosterone</td>
<td>0.001 (0.003); p=0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000 (0.002); p=0.820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3.5
MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BONE MINERAL DENSITY IN PARKINSON’S DISEASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression coefficients (standard error); p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multivariate analysis BMD Lumbar Spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.09 (0.03); p=0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>0.01 (0.00); p&lt;0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-OH-Vitamin-D</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001); p=0.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isometric grip strength</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

This study showed that over 50% of sedentary patients with early PD had an abnormal BMD. Specifically, 41.4% had osteopenia and 11.8% had osteoporosis. These findings are largely consistent with previous studies, although the prevalence observed here was lower compared to other studies, which may be explained by the lower H&Y stages in our cohort. Indeed, others have found a greater decrease in BMD in the subgroup of patients with more advanced disease. A higher prevalence of bone loss in more advanced PD can be explained by further diminished activities in daily life, greater motor impairment, less sunlight exposure due to greater immobility, and continuing weight loss, which all result in a further lowering of vitamin D levels.

We should point out that the median Z-scores for bone loss were very close to zero. Therefore, the prevalence of osteoporosis in PD may not be more common than in the general population. However, the absolute prevalence of osteopenia and osteoporosis is very high in this sample. Considering the morbidity and mortality related to hip fractures, especially in PD, it is important to be aware of this high prevalence of bone loss even in early stages of the disease. Together with the high risk of falls (even in HY stage 2-2.5), bone loss is an important risk factor for fractures in PD patients. In our study, female gender, weight loss and low 25-OH-vitamin D levels were identified as significant risk factors associated with lower BMD. Female gender and weight loss are well-recognized risk factors for bone loss in the general population and in patients with PD. Weight loss is reported frequently in PD, also during early stages of the disease, and women with PD are at higher risk.

To help prevent such fractures, preventive strategies are needed, including supplementation of the vitamin D deficiency observed here and by others, or by promoting physical activities. Preventing or reverting weight loss might also help, as reduced body weight was an additional risk factor for bone loss. In addition, gait and balance training (and in particular treatment strategies aimed at reducing freezing of gait) may help to reduce falls. The high incidence of vitamin D deficiency observed in the present study is remarkable. It has been suggested that vitamin D deficiency is caused by sunlight deprivation, and low vitamin D levels induce compensatory hyperparathyroidism, with further contributes to low BMD in patients with PD. However, in our study patients experienced sufficient sunlight exposure. Furthermore, our results demonstrated that PD patients had significant lower levels of 25-OH-vitamin D compared with controls. Several studies have confirmed these findings. One study additionally showed that vitamin D deficiency was more common in PD compared to patients with Alzheimer disease. Larger studies remain necessary to further investigate the association between vitamin D and bone loss. Pending further evidence, it is important to be alert of vitamin D deficiency in PD and its possible effect on BMD and muscle strength. We therefore recommend to consider routine measurement of vitamin D in older patients with PD, even in early stages of their disease.

The present study is the largest series of PD patients who received bone densitometry measurement. The results of previous studies on the prevalence of osteoporosis are inconsistent and not all studies used the same methods of assessment of BMD or the WHO definitions. A major advantage of our study is that many risk factors associated with bone loss were taken into account. Our study also had several limitations. First, due to its cross-sectional nature, the associations observed here cannot be taken as definitive evidence of a causal relationship. Second, the lack of a control group for the BMD is a limitation. However, bone mineral density inherently has its own controls owing to the method of the statistical measurement of T and Z-scores. As such, a mean Z score of 0 would equate to an equivalent age-matched population. Finally, the present study was performed in a subgroup of patients selected from the ParkFit trial, an RCT that specifically selected sedentary PD patients, aiming to promote their levels of physical activity. The present findings can therefore not be extrapolated to all PD patients, but may apply only to this selected subpopulation.

We conclude that BMD is often affected, even in early PD. The lower BMD is mainly associated with vitamin D deficiency, lower body weight and female gender. These could be clinically important because of the concomitant risk of fractures in combination with an increased fall risk. We recommend that older patients with PD are evaluated for the risk of osteoporosis. Besides classical risk factors, vitamin D deficiency and weight loss should be addressed. In the case of osteoporosis, treatment with bisphosphonates could be considered, in combination with calcium and vitamin D supplementation.
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PD is a common neurodegenerative disease characterized by both motor and non-motor symptoms. As a result, many PD patients are limited in their daily activities. Compared to age-matched controls, PD patients have a significantly increased risk of fractures, mainly of the hip. The consequences of such hip fractures in PD can be devastating, including decreased functionality, length of hospital stay, risk of nursing home admission and high mortality rates. One explanation for the increased fracture risk in people with PD are falls, due to postural instability and gait disturbances. However, not all fractures in PD – and especially vertebral fractures – are related to falls. The bone mineral density (BMD) of patients with PD is lower compared to healthy controls, thus worsening the fracture risk. However, it is unclear how many patients with PD experience bone loss. Published estimates of prevalence of osteoporosis in PD vary considerably, and the causes of bone loss, in particular, are not well described in the literature. The aim of this study is to systematically review studies reporting bone loss in PD. In this review, we focus specifically on the pathophysiological mechanisms of bone loss, and treatment in patients with PD.

LITERATURE SEARCH
A Medline search was performed for articles published between January 1975 and January 2011, using the keywords ‘bone mineral density’, ‘bone loss’, ‘BMD’, ‘bone metabolism’, ‘fractures’, ‘Parkinson’s disease’, and ‘parkinsonism’. Moreover, reference lists from the included studies were checked and author’s names were searched for additional studies. All the articles were screened on the basis of their title and abstract. Studies were included if participants had PD and the study evaluated risk factors for, or interventions to prevent, bone loss. Only studies in which dual energy X-ray absorptiometry of the hip and/or spine was used to measure BMD were included. Articles written in languages other than English, expert opinions, case reports, and articles of which the full text was not available were excluded.

SEARCH RESULTS
This search yielded 403 studies. Twelve papers were considered eligible, using the above mentioned criteria (Figure 4.1). Three of those studies were prospective cohort studies, with a follow-up ranging from 1 to 6 years. The others were observational (mostly case control studies). Men and women were equally distributed and mean age varied from 60 to 78 years. Not all studies reported disease severity and duration, but when reported UPDRS varied from 25 to 33. Almost all patients had a Hoehn & Yahr stage greater than 2, and mean disease duration varied from 2 to 6.5 years. Most studies did not take all relevant confounders (e.g. vitamin D concentration) into account. The characteristics of these studies are summarized in Table 4.1.

CLINICAL EVIDENCE
Data from observational and case-control studies suggested an independent association between PD and lower BMD. These data were confirmed by three longitudinal studies. We will discuss these three latter studies in more detail next. Two studies investigated annual loss of BMD in PD patients. Lorentz et al. found significant reductions of total body, total hip and femoral neck BMD (3.9% vs 1.2%) in 26 PD patients compared with 26 controls. Low body weight and low physical activity were risk factors for low BMD, whereas rigidity seemed to be protective, possibly by increasing the mechanical load on bones. BMD however did not correlate with the severity of PD. An important limitation of this study is the small number of patients and controls.

In the Osteoporotic Fractures in Men Study Fink et al. found a significantly (p<0.001) greater total hip bone loss of 1.1% compared to only 0.4% in community-dwelling male patients (19 patients, 4357 controls). However, this study had several limitations: the number of men with PD was limited; PD was self-reported; and the number of patients with follow-up date was low. Schneider et al. investigated a cohort of community-dwelling women with and without PD. For 6 years (73 patients, 8032 controls). The authors found no significant difference in baseline BMD and in bone loss between the two groups after correcting for confounders. Body weight accounted for 60% of the difference in BMD. Because of the small number of patients at follow-up the authors were unable to assess the association of PD with rate of change in hip BMD. Besides the small proportion of patients, this study was also limited by the self-reporting of PD, so the duration and severity of the disease could not be taken into account.

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY
Several factors may contribute to bone loss in PD (Figure 4.2). Most of these develop in the course of PD and affect or reinforce each other.

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND EXERCISE
PD patients are less active compared to healthy controls. Bone tissue is sensitive to its mechanical environment and is continuously stimulated by muscle contraction and weight-bearing movements, and is responding to mechanical stress. Osteocytes and their dendritic connections are able to sense fluid flow driven by stresses placed upon bone. In response to these stresses, osteocytes produce signaling molecules that stimulate bone remodeling by osteoclasts and osteoblasts. Subnormal mechanical stress as a result of immobilization leads to bone loss, with the rate of bone loss being influenced by the duration, intensity, and acuteness of immobilization. There are indications that immobility is associated with bone loss in PD, but research into this is limited. Only three studies investigated the association between physical
performance/exercise and BMD in PD. The authors Lam and Fink found no association, Lorefält, on the other hand, found that the amount of BMD in PD patients was directly correlated to physical activity.\textsuperscript{52, 106, 108} Data on the association between BMD and the severity of PD are also conflicting. Only one prospective study mentioned severity. They found no correlation between BMD and severity of PD symptoms. However, besides the small number of patients, none of the patients was severely disabled.\textsuperscript{52} In contrast, results of most observational studies have suggested a significant association between disease severity and BMD. These studies also consisted of small number of patients. Most studies did not account for all potential confounders.\textsuperscript{129-131, 140, 141} Although the evidence is scarce, it seems plausible that physical inactivity, which worsens as the disease progresses, contributes to bone loss in PD.

**TABLE 4.1**

LITERATURE ABOUT BMD AND PD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Author (reference nr)</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Number of patients/ controls</th>
<th>Outcome measure (DEXA)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lam\textsuperscript{108}</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>108/215</td>
<td>Hip (four subregions), lumbar spine and body BMD</td>
<td>Female, but not male patients with PD have lower hip BMD ($p&lt;0.005$). After multivariate adjustment, the result did not reach statistical significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abou-Kaya\textsuperscript{192}</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>82/68</td>
<td>Lumbar spine and femoral neck BMD.</td>
<td>PD patients have significantly lower BMD at lumbar spine and femoral neck (respectively $p&lt;0.005$ and $p&lt;0.001$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song\textsuperscript{109}</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>107/100</td>
<td>Lumbar spine and femoral neck BMD.</td>
<td>Femoral neck and lumbar spine BMD were significantly lower in PD ($p&lt;0.005$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezza\textsuperscript{111}</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>52/52</td>
<td>Lumbar spine and dual femur BMD</td>
<td>BMD at lumbar spine and hip was lower in PD (respectively $p&lt;0.001$ and $p&lt;0.02$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fink\textsuperscript{132}</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>46/5891</td>
<td>Hip BMD</td>
<td>Total hip bone loss was greater in men with PD ($p&lt;0.001$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider\textsuperscript{107}</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>73/8032</td>
<td>Total hip and femoral neck BMD</td>
<td>Total hip BMD was lower in women with PD ($p&lt;0.01$). After multivariate adjustment, the result did not reach statistical significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamanli\textsuperscript{141}</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28/31</td>
<td>Lumbar spine, proximal femur and hand BMD.</td>
<td>In females, but not male, patients hand and femoral neck BMD were significantly lower ($p&lt;0.05$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorefält\textsuperscript{52}</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26/26</td>
<td>Hip and total body BMD</td>
<td>The BMD was lower at all sites in PD at year 1 and 2 compared with controls ($p&lt;0.05$) and decreased during the investigated year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Monaco\textsuperscript{140}</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28/28</td>
<td>Hip (five subregions) BMD</td>
<td>BMD did not differ significantly between PD patients and controls with hip fracture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood\textsuperscript{106}</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>105/-</td>
<td>Hip (three subregions) and lumbar spine BMD</td>
<td>41.9% of the PD patients had osteoporosis and 34.5% osteopenia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fink\textsuperscript{106}</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>52/5943</td>
<td>Hip (three subregions) and lumbar spine BMD</td>
<td>PD was associated with lower BMD at the spine ($p=0.04$) and total hip ($p=0.07$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taggart\textsuperscript{117}</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>51/51</td>
<td>Hip and lumbar spine BMD</td>
<td>Total hip ($p&lt;0.014$) and femoral neck ($p&lt;0.005$) BMD were decreased in PD patients. No significant difference was found for the lumbar spine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITAMIN D DEFICIENCY

Vitamin D has a crucial role in bone metabolism, and a shortage of vitamin D is correlated with an increased risk of falls and fractures. Vitamin D deficiency results in hypocalcemia and compensatory hyperparathyroidism, and an excess of parathyroid hormone causes bone resorption by stimulating osteoclast activity. Vitamin D deficiency is common in PD and may be related to malnutrition, immobility and sunlight deprivation. The prevalence of vitamin D insufficiency is significantly higher in patients with PD compared to healthy controls or patients with Alzheimer disease, which suggests that there is a specific association between PD and vitamin D deficiency. Vitamin D has an important role in bone metabolism, and a shortage of vitamin D is correlated with an increased risk of falls and fractures. Vitamin D deficiency is common in PD and may be related to malnutrition, immobility and sunlight deprivation. The prevalence of vitamin D insufficiency is significantly higher in patients with PD compared to healthy controls or patients with Alzheimer disease, which suggests that there is a specific association between PD and vitamin D deficiency. Vitamin D has a crucial role in bone metabolism, and a shortage of vitamin D is correlated with an increased risk of falls and fractures. Vitamin D deficiency is common in PD and may be related to malnutrition, immobility and sunlight deprivation. The prevalence of vitamin D insufficiency is significantly higher in patients with PD compared to healthy controls or patients with Alzheimer disease, which suggests that there is a specific association between PD and vitamin D deficiency. Vitamin D has a crucial role in bone metabolism, and a shortage of vitamin D is correlated with an increased risk of falls and fractures. Vitamin D deficiency is common in PD and may be related to malnutrition, immobility and sunlight deprivation. The prevalence of vitamin D insufficiency is significantly higher in patients with PD compared to healthy controls or patients with Alzheimer disease, which suggests that there is a specific association between PD and vitamin D deficiency. Vitamin D has a crucial role in bone metabolism, and a shortage of vitamin D is correlated with an increased risk of falls and fractures. Vitamin D deficiency is common in PD and may be related to malnutrition, immobility and sunlight deprivation. The prevalence of vitamin D insufficiency is significantly higher in patients with PD compared to healthy controls or patients with Alzheimer disease, which suggests that there is a specific association between PD and vitamin D deficiency.

MUSCLE STRENGTH

Both vitamin D deficiency and decreased mobility reduce muscle strength (figure 4.2). Muscle strength has been negatively associated with BMD in various populations, and bone formation and remodeling may be affected by local mechanical signals generated by muscle contraction. Environmental influences (exercise, nutrition, vitamin D) as well as genetic factors influence this bone–muscle relationship. The isokinetic muscle strength of patients with PD is reduced compared with age-matched controls, even in early disease stages, and declines further with disease progression. The specific cause of this weakness is not known. One study reported lower extremity muscle strength (isometric hip flexion and knee extension) to be associated with hip BMD in women with PD (34 patients, 30 controls), after correcting for several confounders. Another study investigated the association between lumbar spine BMD and trunk muscle strength and found trunk muscle strength to be independently associated with lumbar spine BMD (43 patients, 29 controls). Both studies were limited by small sample sizes and possible selection bias.

LOW BODY WEIGHT

Several studies have suggested that low body weight is a risk factor for low BMD in PD. Schneider et al found that weight accounted for 60% of the age-adjusted difference in hip BMD in 73 women with PD compared with 8032 controls. One explanation is the decreased mechanical load. In addition, a lower body fat content is associated with lower estradiol production in postmenopausal women, leading to a reduced BMD. Patients with PD are at high risk of poor nutrition for several reasons, such as impaired hand-mouth coordination, dysphagia, intestinal hypomotility, depression, cognitive deficits, and side effects of medication. At the same time, there is an increased energy requirement due to muscular rigidity and involuntary movements. In addition, malnutrition can lead to low levels of vitamin D, folate acid, and vitamin B12, with negative consequences on bone formation and strength.

HYPERHOMOCYSTEINEMIA

Hyperhomocysteinemia is an independent risk factor for osteoporotic fractures. The catabolism of homocysteine depends on folic acid, vitamin B12, and vitamin B6, and thus folic acid and vitamin B12 deficiency can cause hyperhomocysteinemia. Homocysteine has a direct effect on bone by binding to extracellular collagen, which interferes with the formation of collagen cross-linking. In addition, in vitro studies have shown that homocysteine stimulates the differentiation of osteoclasts and induces apoptosis of osteoblasts. The first mechanism results in poor bone quality and the second reduces BMD, both contributing to an increased fracture risk.
Hypermocysteinemia is common in PD and is associated with fracture risk and a low BMD. In addition to vitamin B12 and folic acid deficiency, levodopa use may cause hyperhomocysteinemia. Levodopa and dopamine are methylated by catechol O-methyltransferase (COMT), with S-adenosylhomocysteine as methyl donor, to form S-adenohomocysteine. Since S-adenohomocysteine is rapidly converted to homocysteine, levodopa therapy can lead to hyperhomocysteinemia. Theoretically, inhibition of COMT should reduce levodopa-induced hyperhomocysteinemia, but the literature on this is contradictory. These discrepancies in the literature might be related to the different levels of vitamin B12 and folic acid in the included patients. Two studies have shown that supplementation of vitamin B12 and folic acid decreases homocysteine levels in levodopa-treated patients. Moreover, Lee et al. concluded that homocysteine-lowering therapy with folic acid and vitamin B12 prevents bone loss in levodopa-treated patients. Another recent study found that not levodopa use, but decreased levels of vitamin B12 and folic acid, cause hyperhomocysteinemia in PD.

### MANAGEMENT AND TREATMENT

The paragraphs above indicate that a complex interaction between various factors can contribute to bone loss in patients with PD. Optimal management calls for careful assessment of all these factors, followed by tailored treatment where possible. Because scientific evidence concerning the treatment of osteoporosis in PD is scarce, we would like to recommend clinicians to treat PD patients according to the same principles that apply to non-parkinsonian patients. Specific recommendations for treatment include: (a) lifestyle factors & exercise; (b) dietary supplementation; and (c) anti-osteoporotic medication.

The WHO developed the calculation tool FRAX to evaluate fracture risk of patients based on individual patient models that integrate clinical risk factors as well as BMD at the femoral neck. The risk factors of having ‘PD’ or ‘falls related to PD’ have however, not been quantified sufficiently in FRAX to give an accurate 10-year probability of fracture in these patient categories. The FRAX calculation tool can therefore not be recommended in calculating fracture risk in PD patients.

### LIFESTYLE FACTORS / EXERCISE

Smoking and alcohol are well known risk factors for osteoporosis, so patients should be advised to stop smoking and reduce alcohol consumption. Exercise is recognized as key modifiable lifestyle factor that is essential to the prevention and management of osteoporosis. Physical activity programs for maintaining BMD are based on a site-specific modifying effect, in addition to strengthening muscles and improving balance, thus reducing the overall risk of falls and fractures. The influence of exercise on BMD in PD is not well studied. The ParkFit study is currently being conducted. It researches whether a physical activity promotion program can increase physical activity levels in sedentary patients with PD.

### DIETARY SUPPLEMENTATION

Sato et al. performed a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of 1α-hydroxyvitamin D3 supplementation (1 µg/day) for 18 months in patients with PD (43 patients in both groups). After 18 months the treatment group showed a smaller decrease in BMD (1.2% vs 6.7%; p<0.00) and a lower risk of non-vertebral fractures (18.6% vs 2.3%; OR 9.8, p=0.003). Lee et al. studied the effect of homocysteine-lowering therapy on preventing bone loss in patients with PD taking levodopa. Patients were randomly assigned to treatment (n=14) (folic acid 5 mg daily, mecobalamin 500 µg three times daily) or no treatment (n=13). Both groups took daily oral supplements of calcium (500 mg) and cholecalciferol (1000 IU). Follow-up was 12 months. The authors found that homocysteine-lowering therapy resulted in significantly greater improvements in BMD at the lumbar spine (4.4%), total femur (2.8%), and femur shaft (2.8%). Although this was a small trial and fracture reduction was not taken into account, it is an easy therapy with minor side effects.

### ANTI-OSTEOPOROTIC MEDICATION

Only three studies focused on pharmacological treatment of osteoporosis in PD, all considering bisphosphonates. The role for selective estrogen receptor modulators and strontium ranelate has not been evaluated in patients with PD.

The first study, a 2-year, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, studied the effect of alendronate in men with PD (121 patients in both groups). Alendronate (2.5 mg) and ergocalciferol (1000 IU) daily were compared with ergocalciferol (1000 IU) and placebo. BMD increased 2.2% in the alendronate group and decreased 2.9% in the placebo group, while nine patients in the placebo group and three patients in the alendronate group sustained hip fractures. So, alendronate reduced the relative risk of hip fracture by 0.33 (95% CI, 0.09 to 1.20). The same authors reported similar benefits in a study of elderly women with PD allocated to once weekly 17.5mg alendronate and ergocalciferol compared to ergocalciferol and placebo (136 patients in both groups). The third study investigated the effect of alendronate in a 2-year randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of elderly women with PD (144 patients in both groups). Patients were treated daily with alendronate (5 mg) or placebo, and both groups received ergocalciferol (1000 IU). BMD increased 1.3% in the intervention group and decreased 2.8% in the control group. Alendronate reduces the relative risk of hip fractures (14 vs 4 fractures) by 0.29 (95% CI, 0.10-0.85). A shortcoming of these studies was that BMD measurements were performed at the second metacarpal using computer X-ray densitometry and not DEXA at the hip. Nevertheless, they found a decrease in the number of fractures. Altogether, bisphosphonates seems to be effective for osteoporosis in PD. No drug interaction occur with levodopa or other medications used to treat PD and when a patient experience dysphagia bisphosphonates can be administrated intravenously.
CONCLUSION

Patients with PD have a lower BMD than age-matched controls. This reduced bone mass, in combination with frequent falls, explains the increased fracture risk. The BMD reduction in PD is multifactorial in origin, involving reduced mobility, vitamin D deficiency, hyperhomocysteinemia (caused by levodopa use, or vitamin B12 or folic acid deficiency), malnutrition/low body weight, and decreased muscle strength. All these factors are common in PD and act synergistically (figure 4.2). It is essential to monitor these factors in order to assess the risk of osteoporosis and, consequently, reduce fracture risk. Patients with PD are currently not routinely screened for osteoporosis\(^{191}\), yet the high incidence of fractures in these patients, resulting in an increased morbidity and mortality, makes careful management necessary. An extensive risk assessment should be performed, including medication use, level of immobilization, muscle strength, and nutritional status. If a patient has several risk factors, then BMD should be measured with DEXA. If osteoporosis is present, treatment should be started with bisphosphonates and vitamin D supplementation, and an adequate intake of calcium. Osteoporosis in PD has not been extensively studied and further research is needed. Larger and more powerful studies should investigate the pathophysiology of osteoporosis in PD and ways to prevent bone loss and reduce the incidence of fractures.
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INTRODUCTION

Nearly all patients with PD experience gait problems, often already in early disease stages, with clear worsening as the disease progresses. It would be helpful to have a simple and objective tool to quantify gait, both in the laboratory setting and in the patient’s own home environment. This could facilitate clinical decision making, or can be used as outcome measure in clinical trials. It is currently possible to provide very detailed assessments in the gait laboratory, for example using motion analysis systems. While accurate, such evaluations are also expensive, and not necessarily reflective of real-life performance. Moreover, the gait laboratory only documents walking impairments, but does not investigate the subject’s actual walking behavior.

To address these limitations, ambulatory gait monitors have been introduced to quantify movements of the limbs or trunk during a prolonged time in daily life. In healthy subjects, ambulatory monitors can record spatiotemporal gait parameters such as stride cycles, numbers of left and right steps, step length and walking speed over ground walking. Later work also concentrated on applying activity monitors in patients with PD. However, none of these studies evaluated the ability of activity monitors to estimate walking distances in patients with PD. We therefore evaluated the ability of a simple activity monitor (based on tri-axial accelerometers) to estimate walking distance in PD.

METHODS

We conducted two separate experiments. In Experiment A we evaluated the ability of the activity monitor to estimate short (maximum distance 27 meters) and simple (straight) walking trajectories. In Experiment B we evaluated the ability to quantify a much longer (maximum distance 1097 meters) and more complex ‘real life’ walking trajectory (walking in the hospital corridors, with curves and path deviations).

SUBJECTS

In Experiment A, we included 28 PD patients (Table 5.1). In Experiment B we included a separate new cohort of 23 PD patients (Table 5.1). All patients were randomly recruited from the Parkinson Centre Nijmegen. Inclusion criteria was idiopathic PD. In experiment A, patients had to be able to walk a distance of 30 meters. In experiment B, patients had to be able to walk a distance of 2000 meters. Exclusion criterion was a relevant gait impairment other than PD. All patients were measured in the ‘ON’ state. Before the experiment the Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating scale (UPDRS) motor score and Hoehn and Yahr stage were obtained by a neurologist. Height, body weight and leg length were also measured. All subjects gave written informed consent prior to the study, as approved by the local Medical Ethical Committee.

EXPERIMENT A: SHORT AND LINEAR WALKING TRAJECTORY

For this purpose, patients walked at their preferred speed along a marked linear distance in a hallway (ranging between 21 and 27 meters).

EXPERIMENT B: LONG AND MORE COMPLEX ‘REAL LIFE’ WALKING DISTANCE

For this purpose, we created a walking trajectory through a public building, composed of five segments (figure 5.1A). The length of each segment was measured three times with a measuring wheel. The average served as the reference distance. The total trajectory amounted 1097 meters. Halfway the walk patients were asked if they were able to walk the whole trajectory. If this was not possible, because of exhaustion for instance, the trajectory was shortened to 913 meters. 74% of the patients walked the whole trajectory.

DATA-ANALYSIS

The Dynaport Gait Monitor software (McRoberts, The Hague, The Netherlands) was used for data analysis. Walking distance and step length were estimated based on the amplitude of vertical pelvic displacement and leg length, using a simple inverted pendulum model of walking.

STATISTICS

The actually measured walking distance was taken as the gold standard. All analyses were done on the log-transformed data, because the logarithmic transformation removed the skewness. We then used the normal distribution (on the logarithmic transformed data) to calculate the limits of agreement, i.e. the 5th and 95th percentiles of the differences between the methods.

MATERIALS

The activity monitor that was used in this study (Dynaport AM, Mc Roberts BV, The Hague, The Netherlands) is a small (64x62x13) and lightweight (55 g) instrument that measures accelerations of the lower trunk using tri-axial accelerometers. The sample rate is 100 Hz. Data is stored on a SD card. The device is placed in a belt, positioned on the lower back between the posterior superior iliac spines. To study walking distances, the activity monitor was first calibrated by walking two trajectories of 10 meter and two of 20 meter before starting the experiment.
RESULTS

Mean (sd) distance measured with the activity monitor in the subgroups of patients (shortened trajectory and whole trajectory) in experiment B were 1037.6m (sd: 189.3) and 1059.04m (sd: 195.9) (Figure 5.1B). The measured distance of the activity monitor was not significantly different between the subgroups (p = 0.819). Analysis of the short and long walking distance did not suggest any relevant systematic errors. We therefore calculated the unadjusted limits of agreement. In case of short walking distances the difference between the results and the gold standard was smaller than 16%. In case of a longer walking distance the limits of agreements were -43 and +41%. The difference between the results and the golden standard did exceed more than 40%. The subjects did not experience interference or inconvenience of the body-fixed instrumentation.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to evaluate the ability of the Dynaport activity monitor to estimate walking distances in PD. Precision of this activity monitor to estimate short walking distances was good, as demonstrated by adequate limits of agreement. However, the precision to estimate long walking distances was less appropriate, with wide limits of agreement. This means that the device can measure a changed walking distance in evaluative research, but only large changes can be detected or large patient groups are needed. This moderate precision limits the use of this activity monitor for clinical purposes. This activity monitor might be used as a screening tool, to estimate walking distances, but the actual walking distance might be the measured distance plus or minus 40%.
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ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND
Patients with PD are physically less active than controls, and autonomic dysfunction may contribute to this sedentary lifestyle. Specifically, an altered cardiovascular response to physical effort may restrict physical activities. Here, the cardiovascular responses to a submaximal exercise test were assessed in PD patients and controls.

METHODS
546 sedentary PD patients and 29 sedentary healthy controls performed the Åstrand-Rhyming submaximal cycle exercise test. The average heart rate was used to estimate maximal oxygen consumption (VO₂max). Variables that may affect submaximal activity in PD patients, including disease severity, fatigue, and level of physical activity in daily life, were recorded.

RESULTS
Fewer PD patients (46%) completed the submaximal exercise test successfully than the controls (86%). The estimated VO₂max of patients with a successful test was 34% lower than the controls (p<0.001). Multivariate regression analyses revealed that higher body weight, lower systolic blood pressure, lower resting heart rate, and lower maximal workload were associated with an increased risk of an inadequate heart rate increase during submaximal exercise (R²=27%). PD patients with a successful submaximal exercise test had lower estimated VO₂max values than controls.

CONCLUSION
Importantly, half of the PD patients had an inadequate heart rate increase during submaximal exercise, which was likely caused by cardiac sympathetic denervation leading to autonomic dysfunction. PD patients should therefore be screened to identify their limitations in exercise performance. Caution should be applied when prescribing beta blockers, as they might limit physical activities further.

INTRODUCTION
Patients with PD are physically less active than controls. Several possible factors may account for this physically inactive lifestyle. Patients with PD develop a range of motor symptoms, including gait disturbances and balance instability. Furthermore, patients with PD develop several non-motor symptoms such as depression, apathy, and cognitive dysfunction. Taken together, these motor and non-motor symptoms can discourage PD patients from becoming physically active. Here, we tested the hypothesis that autonomic dysfunction is an additional contributing factor of physical inactivity in PD. Autonomic dysfunction occurs in more than 50% of PD patients and can affect cardiovascular responses to physical activity, thereby restricting exercise performance. However, the influence of autonomic dysfunction on exercise in PD has not been investigated extensively.

METHODS
PARTICIPANTS
The study population consisted of 586 PD patients participating in the ParkFit study, a randomized controlled trial evaluating the effectiveness of a multifaceted behavioral program to increase physical activity in PD patients, and 29 age- and gender-matched controls (Table 6.1). Patients were recruited from September 2008 through January 2010, and controls were recruited from January 2011 through June 2011. Eligibility criteria for all participants were as follows: (a) age between 40 and 75 years; and (b) a sedentary lifestyle that was defined as <3 times a week of vigorous intensity physical activity for <60 minutes or <3 times a week of moderate intensity physical activity for <150 minutes. All PD patients were diagnosed in accordance with the UK Brain Bank Criteria. Exclusion criteria for all participants were as follows: (a) inability to complete Dutch questionnaires; (b) severe co-morbidity interfering with daily functions; (c) daily institutionalized care; (d) pulmonary disease; and (e) high risk of cardiovascular complications. For the PD patients, the following additional exclusion criteria were applied: (a) unclear diagnosis (i.e. no gratifying and sustained response to dopaminergic therapy); (b) Mini-Mental State Examination score <24; and (c) deep-brain surgery. Each subject provided written informed consent prior to the study, which was approved by the local Medical Ethics Committee (CMO Regio Arnhem-Nijmegen).
EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Physical fitness was assessed using the Åstrand-Rhyming submaximal exercise test on a stationary bicycle. The subjects were seated on a model 939E bicycle ergometer (Monark, Vansbro, Sweden). The exercise protocol started after a one-minute warm-up stage at 50-watt resistance. After warming up, the workload was increased during the first three minutes of the test. During the last three minutes, the workload was kept constant in order to achieve a steady-state heart rate. The subjects were asked to maintain a cycling rate of 70 rpm, and the total duration of the test was six minutes. If the heart rate in the fifth and sixth minutes of the test differed by more than five beats per minute, the test was prolonged by one minute in order to achieve a steady-state heart rate. This submaximal exercise test was followed by a cooling-down period of at least three minutes. All patients were asked to take their dopaminergic medication two hours before assessment.

ASSESSMENTS

The level of physical activity was measured using a validated interview-based 7-day recall in the form of the LAPAQ questionnaire. Fatigue was measured using the Fatigue Severity scale (FSS) in the PD patients, disease stage was scored according to the modified Hoehn and Yahr scale (H&Y), and motor function was assessed using the Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS III, motor examination). In addition, clinical characteristics such as disease time since diagnosis and daily levodopa equivalent dose were assessed. Blood pressure at rest was measured in the right upper arm using an automatic blood pressure device (Microlife, model BP3AC1-1). During the submaximal exercise test, heart rate was continuously recorded using a Polar Pacer Tester (Polar, Favor, Kempele, Finland). Perceived exertion was recorded at the end of the test using the Borg’s 6–20 rating of perceived exertion (RPE) scale in which a score of 6 indicates ‘light exertion’, and a score of 20 indicates ‘extreme exertion’.

DATA ANALYSIS

The submaximal exercise test was considered to be successful if it fulfilled the following criteria: 1) a steady-state heart rate (i.e. no more than a 5-bpm change in heart rate in the last two minutes of the test) and 2) a heart rate >120 bpm in the last two minutes of the test (70-75% of the estimated maximal heart rate). When the submaximal exercise test met these criteria, physical fitness was then estimated using maximal oxygen consumption (VO2max), which was estimated from the Åstrand-nomogram using mean steady-state heart rate with corrections for age and gender.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Differences in VO2max between the PD patients and controls were evaluated using a t-test and Chi-squared test. Univariate logistic regression analysis was used to determine the variables that were significantly associated with achieving a heart rate >120 bpm in the PD patients during the test and included age, gender, resting heart rate, blood pressure, level of daily physical activity, fatigue, maximal workload, perceived exertion, UPDRS III motor examination, disease duration, and PD-related medication. Logistic multiple stepwise regression analysis was used to determine whether the different variables jointly affected the exercise test in PD patients.

RESULTS

Five hundred and forty-five of the original 586 PD patients and 29 controls performed the submaximal exercise test; 41 PD patients did not perform the submaximal exercise test due to technical problems. Ninety-two (17%) of the patients were excluded from the analyses due to the use of beta blockers (Figure 6.1), none of the controls used beta blockers. The characteristics of the remaining 453 patients and 29 controls are presented in Table 6.1.

Two hundred and forty-one (53%) of the PD patients and four (14%) of the controls had an unsuccessful submaximal exercise test. Of these 241 patients and four controls, 53 (22%) patients and three controls terminated the submaximal exercise test prematurely due to exhaustion, 57 patients (24%) did not reach a steady-state heart rate at the end of the test (i.e. had a >5-beat per minute variance), and 131 (54%) patients and one control reached a steady-state heart rate during the submaximal exercise test but had an inadequate heart rate increase (<120 bpm). This left 212 (46%) patients and 25 (86%) controls with a steady-state heart rate and an adequate heart rate increase during submaximal exercise for inclusion in the analysis (Figure 6.1).

The estimated VO2max of the PD patients with a successful test was significantly lower than controls (p<0.001) (Table 6.2). Similar results were obtained when the level of daily physical activity was included in the analysis as a covariate.

Next, the 131 PD patients with an unsuccessful submaximal exercise test due to an inadequate increase in heart rate were compared with the 212 patients with a successful submaximal exercise test (Table 6.3). With the exceptions of H&Y stage and PD medication, all factors were significantly associated with the ability to increase heart rate sufficiently during submaximal exercise. Multiple stepwise regression yielded a model in which higher body weight, lower systolic blood pressure, lower resting heart rate, and lower maximal workload were associated with an increased risk of an inadequate heart rate increase during submaximal exercise. This model explained 27% of the variance. No relationship between the factors disease duration, H&Y stage, UPDRS III motor examination, and PD medication and the ability to increase heart rate during submaximal exercise was found.
TABLE 6.1
CHARACTERISTICS OF PD PATIENTS AND CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PD patients (N=453)</th>
<th>Controls (N=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, years (SD)</td>
<td>64 (7.7)</td>
<td>61.5 (10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, kg (SD)</td>
<td>81 (13.9)</td>
<td>80.1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, cm (SD)</td>
<td>172 (10.1)</td>
<td>171 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg/m² (SD)</td>
<td>27.3 (4.1)</td>
<td>27.3 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;Y stage, number of patients (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 (1.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16 (3.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>339 (74.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>68 (15%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 (5.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS III (SD)</td>
<td>32.7 (10.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration, years (SD)</td>
<td>5.2 (4.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPAQ total (inter-quartile range)</td>
<td>13.2 (8.6 – 20.9)</td>
<td>10.2 (5.2 – 12.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect mean (SD), median (IQR-range) or number (%). PD = Parkinson’s disease, BMI = body mass index, UPDRS III = unified Parkinson’s disease rating scale part III. LAPAQ = LASA Physical Activity Questionnaire.

TABLE 6.2
PERFORMANCE DURING THE ÅSTRAND-RHYMING SUBMAXIMAL EXERCISE TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PD patients (N=453)</th>
<th>Controls (N=29)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean heart rate end of test, bpm (SD)</td>
<td>135.8 (12.2)</td>
<td>138.6 (11.8)</td>
<td>-7.8 to 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximal workload, W (SD)</td>
<td>88.0 (27.9)</td>
<td>95.6 (29.9)</td>
<td>-19 to 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived exertion (SD)</td>
<td>15.4 (2.1)</td>
<td>14.1 (1.8)</td>
<td>0.4 to 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO2max, ml/min/kg (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both genders</td>
<td>21.9 (5.4)</td>
<td>33.0 (8.5)</td>
<td>-13.5 to -8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>23.1 (5.1)</td>
<td>35.7 (8.7)</td>
<td>-15.5 to -9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>20.1 (5.3)</td>
<td>27.5 (4.3)</td>
<td>-11.3 to -3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect mean (SD). 95% CI = Confidence interval. PD = Parkinson’s disease, W = Watts, VO2max = maximal oxygen consumption; BPM = beats per minute.
TABLE 6.3
THE GROUPS OF PD PATIENTS WHO DID OR DID NOT REACH A HEART RATE >120 BPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PD Patients HR &lt;120 (N=131)</th>
<th>PD patients HR &gt;120 (N=212)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics and disease severity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, years (SD)</td>
<td>66.1 (6.8)</td>
<td>61.8 (7.7)</td>
<td>2.7 to 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg/m² (SD)</td>
<td>28.1 (3.9)</td>
<td>26.9 (4.1)</td>
<td>0.3 to 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, cm (SD)</td>
<td>173.3 (9.7)</td>
<td>172.6 (10.1)</td>
<td>-1.5 to 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, kg (SD)</td>
<td>84.5 (15.2)</td>
<td>80.1 (12.9)</td>
<td>1.4 to 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS III (SD)</td>
<td>33.8 (9.5)</td>
<td>31.0 (10.3)</td>
<td>0.6 to 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration, years (SD)</td>
<td>5.7 (4.8)</td>
<td>4.7 (4.2)</td>
<td>0.1 to 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LED doses (SD)</td>
<td>323.3 (428.5)</td>
<td>436.5 (563.4)</td>
<td>1.3 to 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of physical activity, hours/week (inter-quartile range)</td>
<td>12.5 (7.9 – 18.5)</td>
<td>14 (9.3 – 21)</td>
<td>-3.7 to 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue Severity Scale (SD)</td>
<td>44 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.8 (1.4)</td>
<td>0.2 to 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean heart rate end of test, bpm (SD)</td>
<td>106.3 (10.1)</td>
<td>135.8 (12.2)</td>
<td>-32 to -27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximal workload, W (SD)</td>
<td>78 (24.6)</td>
<td>88 (27.9)</td>
<td>-16.2 to -4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived exertion (SD)</td>
<td>15.7 (2.2)</td>
<td>15.4 (2)</td>
<td>-0.2 to 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resting heart rate, bpm (SD)</td>
<td>70.7 (11.2)</td>
<td>80.8 (13.2)</td>
<td>-12.9 to -7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure systolic, mmHg</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>-8.6 to -0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure diastolic, mmHg</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-6.6 to -2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect mean (SD), median [IQR-range] or percentage [%]. CI = Confidence interval, PD = Parkinson’s disease, BMI = Body Mass Index, UPDRS III = Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale part III, bpm = beats per minute, W = watts, HR = heart rate.

DISCUSSION

We found that only 46% of sedentary PD patients adequately increase their heart rate during a submaximal exercise test, whereas nearly all sedentary controls (86%) achieved an adequate increase in heart rate during the same test. Moreover, the PD patients who were unable to successfully complete the test (i.e. reached a steady-state heart rate but had an inadequate heart rate increase) had a lower resting heart rate and lower systolic blood pressure. Finally, we found that PD patients who successfully completed the submaximal exercise test had a lower estimated VO₂max than the controls.

This is the first study to demonstrate altered cardiovascular responses during submaximal exercise in sedentary PD patients with respect to healthy controls. An abnormal cardiovascular response to maximal exercise has been demonstrated previously, however, these studies focused on heart rate during maximal effort and did not find an altered cardiovascular response during submaximal exercise. For example, Werner et al. reported that during higher exercise intensities, half of the PD patients failed to reach 85% of the age predicted target heart rate, but they found no differences between PD patients and controls during submaximal exercise. In addition, Reuter et al. measured cardiovascular function using a cycle exercise test with a ramp protocol and found a less-responsive systolic blood pressure during the exercise test and a slightly elevated heart rate in the PD patients during low-intensity exercise. Katzel et al. studied 63 PD patients and found that only 11% of patients achieved a true VO₂max on a maximal-effort treadmill test. Most studies included only a relatively small number of PD patients, thereby limiting the robustness (i.e. statistical power) of their results. Because we included a much larger number of PD patients (n=586), we were able to detect a significant difference in cardiovascular responses compared to healthy controls.

The inadequate increase in heart rate during exercise that was observed in this study may have been caused by dopaminergic therapy. Dopaminergic therapy can aggravate the impairment of the automatic control of the blood pressure and heart rate in PD patients. Another explanation of the inadequate increase in heart rate may be cardiac sympathetic denervation that led to autonomic dysfunction. This hypothesis is supported by the lower resting heart rate that was associated with an unsuccessful submaximal exercise test. Goldstein et al. reported that many PD patients have cardiac sympathetic denervation, which can be present in the presymptomatic phase of PD and does not seem to either be restricted to severe cases or occur as a late consequence of the disease. An early onset of cardiac sympathetic denervation might explain why the cardiovascular response to the submaximal exercise test was not related to disease severity in our study. The lower heart rate and blood pressure at rest that were observed in our study may be an additional indication of symptomatic denervation of the heart.
Cardiac sympathetic denervation causes decreased heart rate and cardiac contractibility, which cause decreased cardiac output during exercise and are associated with shortness of breath and fatigue. This can restrict PD patients during the daily activities and might force them to lead a more sedentary lifestyle. Therefore, in an early disease stage, PD patients should be screened for the exercise behavior, and they should be tested to determine whether any limitations in their exercise performance are secondary to cardiac sympathetic denervation and/or autonomic dysfunction, which could have therapeutic consequences, as PD patients with autonomic dysfunction can still exercise but need to be cognizant of their cardiovascular limitations. Importantly, beta blockers should be prescribed with caution in these patients, as beta blockers can aggravate the inadequate cardiac response to exercise.

Even the PD patients with a successful submaximal exercise test had some autonomic abnormalities, as we found a 31% lower estimated VO\textsubscript{2}max in these patients than in the controls. The estimated VO\textsubscript{2}max values that were observed in our study are similar to the values obtained in previous studies of PD patients. However, in these previous studies, no significant difference was found between PD patients and controls. Our study of a much larger cohort of PD patients and controls compared to previous studies likely underlies these differences.

Changes in the body composition of PD patients may explain the low cardiovascular fitness of PD patients. A stooped posture or stiff chest wall muscles can potentially influence aerobic capacity. This was found in a study of patients with ankylosing spondylitis that showed an association between musculoskeletal limitations and restrictive respiratory impairment and significantly impaired pulmonary function compared to controls.

The estimated VO\textsubscript{2}max in our PD patients (22 ml/kg/min) indicates poor cardiovascular fitness, which may have a considerable influence on daily functions. Using an exercise program, it should be possible for PD patients to improve their VO\textsubscript{2}max. Indeed, several studies have shown that an exercise program can both improve physical fitness and ameliorate disease-related symptoms such as sleep disturbances, cognitive dysfunction, and functional motor performance.
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ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND
The sedentary lifestyle of patients with PD adversely affects their health. Reversing this lifestyle is difficult because of combined physical and cognitive handicaps that are intrinsic to PD. Here, we evaluate whether a multifaceted behavioral change program increases physical activities in PD.

METHODS
We performed a multicenter, randomised controlled trial to increase physical activity levels in sedentary PD patients. Patients were randomly assigned to the ParkFit program or a matched general physiotherapy intervention. ParkFit is a multifaceted behavioral change program, designed specifically to achieve an enduring increase in the level of physical activity program (coaches using motivational strategies; ambulatory feedback). Primary endpoint was the level of physical activity, measured every six months using a standardized 7-day recall the LAPAQ questionnaire. Secondary endpoints included two other measures of physical activity (activity diary; and ambulatory activity monitor), quality of life (PDQ-39), and fitness (6-minute walk test).

RESULTS
586 sedentary patients with idiopathic PD between 40 and 75 years with mild to moderate disease severity (Hoehn and Yahr stage ≤3) were randomized; 540 patients (92.3%) completed the primary outcome. During follow-up, overall time spent on physical activities was comparable between both groups (adjusted group difference 7%, 95% CI -3 to 17%, p=0.19). Analyses of three secondary outcomes indicated increased physical activity in ParkFit patients, as suggested by the activity diary (difference 30%; p<0.001), the activity monitor (difference 12%; p<0.001), and 6-minute walk test (difference 4.8 meters; p=0.05). PDQ-39 did not differ between ParkFit and controls (difference -0.9 points; p=0.14). The number of fallers was comparable between ParkFit (62%) and controls (67%).

CONCLUSION
The ParkFit behavioral change program did not increase overall physical activity, as measured with the LAPAQ. The analysis of the secondary endpoints justifies further work into the possible merits of behavioral change programs to increase physical activities in daily life.

INTRODUCTION
PD is a common neurodegenerative disease, characterized by motor symptoms23 and a wide variety of non-motor symptoms like depression or apathy.222 Despite optimal medical treatment, PD remains a progressive disease that negatively affects quality of life. Therefore, allied health interventions are increasingly deployed to treat both the motor and non-motor symptoms of PD. The evidence to support the merits of these interventions is growing, and treatment guidelines (based partially on evidence, and partially on practical clinical experience) for several allied health-care interventions have been developed.10-11 19 In recent years, a number of physiotherapy programs have been tested in patients with PD.99 102 122-123 Reviews and meta-analyses generally found evidence to support ‘exercise’ as being beneficial with regard to physical functioning, strength, balance and gait speed.23-24 However, the physiotherapy programs as tested in these studies were apparently insufficient to achieve an active lifestyle. Indeed, because of their combined physical limitations and mental changes, many PD patients lead a sedentary lifestyle.230 Reversing this lifestyle could have generic health benefits, including increased survival.19 230 231 Promoting physical activity may also improve specific symptoms of PD, such as insomnia, depression or constipation.232 Furthermore, rodent work suggests that physical activity might counter neurodegeneration in experimental parkinsonism.232-233 An individually tailored, disease-specific training program is needed to improve physical activity in PD.234 We developed such an intervention (the ParkFit program)235 based on models of behavioral change99 234 and containing established behavioral change techniques.230-232 To evaluate this program, we designed a randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing ParkFit with a matched control intervention.87

METHODS
The ParkFit trial is a multicenter RCT to increase physical activity levels over the course of two years in sedentary PD patients. The study design has been detailed elsewhere.87

STUDY PARTICIPANTS
Recruitment ran from September 2008 to January 2010. Patients treated in 32 community hospitals were invited to participate. Eligibility criteria were: (a) PD according to UK Brain Bank Criteria;31; (b) age 40–75 years; (c) sedentary lifestyle, defined as: participation in vigorous-intensity physical activity <3 times a week, and for <60 minutes in total per week; or participation in moderate-intensity physical activity <3 times a week, and for <150 minutes in total per week, and (d) Hoehn and Yahr stage ≤3. Exclusion criteria were: (a) MMSE <24; (b) unable to complete Dutch questionnaires; (c) co-morbidity that interfered with daily functioning; (d) daily institutionalized care; and (e) previous deep brain surgery. The protocol was approved by the local ethics committee. Informed consent was obtained before the first assessment.
The diary detailed the frequency and total duration (hours/week) spent on five specific activities:

- Walking outdoors for >10 contiguous minutes;
- Moderate-intensity cycling for >10 contiguous minutes;
- High-intensity cycling for >10 contiguous minutes;
- Sport activities;
- Other strenuous activities (e.g., cutting wood).

We defined four secondary endpoints:

1. Physical fitness, as measured with the 6-minute walk test at 12 and 24 months (i.e., average of all measurements);
2. Quality of life, as measured with the PDQ-39 at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months (i.e., average of all measurements);
3. Physical activity level of the patients. Based on a minimization algorithm with these factors, the treatment was allocated and registered. Before inclusion, patients were informed that the trial compared two potentially beneficial interventions. We used “active” names for both interventions (“ParkFit” and “ParkSafe” program). To ensure blinding, patients were examined by trained assessors who were unaware of group allocation. Patients were instructed not to discuss the nature of their physiotherapy with the assessors.

Both interventions were delivered solely by experienced physiotherapists in the Dutch ParkinsonNet. In total, 154 physiotherapists were trained to deliver both interventions. This ascertained that differences in personality or style of the physiotherapists could not bias the results. All patients were offered an equal maximum number of treatment sessions (35/year). The full study protocol has been detailed elsewhere.

The ParkFit program was designed specifically to achieve a sustained increase in physical activity levels, based on theories and models of behavioural change and on effective behavioural change techniques. Important elements were: (a) activity coaches who guided each patient towards a more active lifestyle during monthly personal coaching sessions; (b) educational brochure about the benefits of physical activity and suitable activities for PD patients; (c)
identifying and overcoming any perceived barriers to engage in physical activity, (d) systematic goal setting, using a health contract and logbook, (e) stimulation to participate in group exercises, and (f) ambulatory monitor with automated feedback reflecting actually delivered physical activities. Ambulatory monitor data were uploaded to a personalized website, where both the patient and coach could monitor progress.

The ParkFit program also included regular physiotherapy sessions. Based on individual disabilities, the therapist and patient jointly formulated individually tailored treatment aims, according to the evidence-based guideline of physiotherapy for PD.

Control intervention
The control intervention consisted of a general physiotherapy program aimed at safety of movements, according to the evidence-based guideline. Patients received an identical brochure as ParkFit patients, but now with information about the benefits of physiotherapy and safety of movements. Patients were offered a maximum number of treatment sessions, similar to the ParkFit program. An active lifestyle was not explicitly stimulated. Treatment aims were jointly formulated by therapist and patient, based on perceived individual disabilities.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
Main endpoint was the physical activity level during the entire follow-up (6, 12, 18 and 24 months). Because the physical activity level was skewed, medians and interquartile ranges were presented, and analyses were performed after logarithmic transformation. Differences between both interventions were evaluated using a linear mixed model with random nested factors ‘patient’ and ‘exercise group’. Region, Hoehn & Yahr stage, age, gender and current physical activity level of the patients were included as covariables. Results were analyzed according to a modified intention-to-treat principle, whereby only patients that had no follow-up measurements at all were excluded.

Sample size calculation
Based on the following power considerations, we aimed to include a total of 700 patients. In a small observational study on physical activity in PD, patients scored 45% less on the LAPAQ compared to controls (unpublished data). The coefficient of variation was 110%. Based on a difference of 20% in hours per week (with coefficient of variation of 110%) between both treatment arms, the mixed model analysis will have at least 80% power (when the correlation between baseline and follow-up measurements is at least 0.50, and when the correlation between the various follow-up measurements is at most 0.75). The decision to define a 20% increase based on the LAPAQ activity as a clinically relevant difference was a pragmatic choice, because there were no earlier intervention studies that aimed to change activity behavior in PD patients. Moreover, prior behavioral change studies in other diseases (e.g. heart failure, diabetes and COPD) did not include the LAPAQ as an endpoint. In an earlier study by our group, we found that PD patients were 29% less active compared to controls (as measured with the LAPAQ): patients spent 12.9 hours per week on physical activity, while controls spent more than 17.5 hours. We deemed an increase in physical activity among PD patients of more than four hours unrealistic, and reasoned that an increase of two hours per week (i.e. an increase of about 20%) would be feasible. We also considered a 2-hour increase in physical activity to be clinically relevant, for the following reasons. A dose-response relation exists between physical activity and cardiovascular disease or premature mortality. Significant risk reductions have been observed with 45-150 minutes/week of brisk walking. Additionally, women who walked or exercised vigorously for at least 2.5 hours/week had a 30% lower risk of coronary heart disease. Conversely, the risk of cardiovascular disease was higher among women who spent >12 hours/day lying down or sleeping. This suggests that a 2-hour increase in physical activities might help to prevent cardiovascular disease. The power is based on two sided 95% confidence intervals. We assumed that the clustering due to the fact that the intervention was carried out in training groups of approximately eight patients leads to an ICC of 0.1. Based on a previous trial of physical therapy in PD, we expected a drop-out rate of 10%.

RESULTS
BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS
586 patients were included (Figure 7.1). 299 patients were randomly assigned to the ParkFit program, and 287 to the control intervention. Both groups had comparable demographic and disease characteristics, although ParkFit patients tended to be less active in daily life (i.e. less time spent on physical activity in hours per week, based on LAPAQ) than controls (Table 7.1).

LOST TO FOLLOW-UP
540 of the 586 participants (92.3%) completed the LAPAQ after 24 months. The proportion of patients lost to follow-up was comparable for ParkFit (8.7%) and controls (6.7%). Patients lost to follow-up were similar to those who completed the assessments, except for a higher age.

COMPLIANCE
75 of the 586 participants (12.7%) did not complete the two-year intervention (ParkFit n=44, controls n=31). Main reasons were refusal to change from a regular physiotherapist to a ParkinsonNet physiotherapist, too much burden, or dissatisfaction with the intervention. Reasons for drop-out were similar between both groups. The mean number of annual individual visits to the physiotherapist did not differ between ParkFit (13.6) and controls (13.0). Patients in both groups were satisfied with the intervention and would recommend the intervention to others (73% versus 71%).
FIGURE 7.1
SCREENING, RANDOMIZATION, AND COMPLETION OF THE PRIMARY OUTCOME MEASURE

TABLE 7.1
BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics &amp; Clinical Characteristics</th>
<th>ParkFit (n = 299)</th>
<th>Controls (n = 287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>65.1 (7.9)</td>
<td>65.9 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>194 (65%)</td>
<td>188 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>27.4 (4.5)</td>
<td>27.6 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration (years)</td>
<td>5.0 (4.5)</td>
<td>5.5 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE</td>
<td>28.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>28.1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Hoehn and Yahr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7 (2.3%)</td>
<td>10 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>221 (73.9%)</td>
<td>223 (77.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>48 (16.1%)</td>
<td>36 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16 (5.4%)</td>
<td>14 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>33.1 (11.3)</td>
<td>32.3 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily levodopa equivalent dose (mg)</td>
<td>458 (362)</td>
<td>499 (414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of physical activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPAQ (hours per week)</td>
<td>12.8 (8.3 - 20.3)</td>
<td>13.8 (8.3 - 23.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect mean (SD), median (IQ-range) or number (%). BMI = Body Mass Index (kg/m²). MMSE = mini-mental state examination. UPDRS III = unified Parkinson’s disease rating scale part III. LAPAQ = LASA Physical Activity Questionnaire.

* No sedentary lifestyle = >3 times a week vigorous-intensity physical activity > 60 minutes; or >3 times a week moderate-intensity physical activity > 150 minutes. ** Severe disease = H&Y > III; MMSE < 24; severe co-morbidity interfering with daily functioning; use of daily care in an institution; or deep brain stimulation.
ENDPOINTS

Primary endpoint
Compared to baseline, overall time spent in physical activities was comparable between both groups (adjusted group difference -7%; 95% confidence interval (CI) -17% to 3%; p=0.19) (Table 7.2).

Secondary endpoints
Both the activity diary and the activity monitor data suggested increased levels of physical activity in ParkFit patients (Table 7.3). Additionally, ParkFit patients increased their physical fitness compared to controls (4.8 meters; 95% CI 0.1 to 9.6; p=0.05) (Table 7.3). Quality of life did not differ between the groups (-0.9 points; 95% CI -0.3 to 2.1; p=0.14).

Safety and falls
Eight patients died during follow-up because of cardiovascular problems, cancer or medical complications (ParkFit n=5, controls n=3). These deaths were unrelated to exercise sessions. Controls reported eight hip fractures, ParkFit patients two. Frequency and severity of all other adverse events were similar in both groups: ParkFit n=221, controls n=242. The number of patients with one or more falls was comparable in both groups: 184 (62%) in ParkFit and 191 (67%) in controls.

TABLE 7.2
EFFECT OF THE INTERVENTION (IN HOURS PER WEEK) ON THE LEVEL OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY MEASURED WITH THE LASA PHYSICAL ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE (LAPAQ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAPAQ total (primary analysis)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ParkFit</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Estimated difference (CI)*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>12.8 (8.3-20.3)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>13.8 (8.3-23.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>13.2 (9.2-20.5)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>14.2 (8.5-22.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>12.5 (7.2-21.1)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>12.4 (7.3-17.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>12.3 (7.0-19.0)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>12.3 (6.8-19.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>12.5 (6.3-18.4)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>12.0 (7.0-18.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated difference (CI)*</td>
<td>7% (-3% to 17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect median (IQ-range); * estimated relative difference, based on mixed model analysis.

DISCUSSION

This RCT shows that a multifaceted behavioural change program does not promote overall physical activities in sedentary PD patients, as measured with the primary outcome (LAPAQ). Two of our secondary outcomes focused on other measures of physical activity, and did suggest improvements for patients allocated to the ParkFit program. This was demonstrated both subjectively (with activity diaries) and objectively (with an ambulatory activity monitor). Moreover, physical fitness (an indirect reflection of greater physical activity) increased in ParkFit patients. Quality of life did not differ between both study arms. The ParkFit group did not experience more falls.
The ParkFit study is therefore a negative trial, showing no difference for the primary outcome (LAPAQ questionnaire) between both study arms. We selected the LAPAQ as primary outcome because it closely reflected the goals of the ParkFit intervention, namely promotion of physical activities. We regarded an actual increase in physical activity levels as a necessary intermediate and prerequisite to eventually obtain health benefits, including improvements in quality of life. The LAPAQ questionnaire is a validated instrument to measure habitual physical activity in large populations. LAPAQ covers a wide range of daily life activities, and we previously demonstrated that PD patients are 29% less active compared to controls, as measured with the LAPAQ. Our study was powered to detect a 20% increase based on the LAPAQ, which would equate to an increase in physical activities of two hours per week. The ParkFit program did not achieve this, suggesting that more robust interventions are needed to promote physical activities in daily life.

Our choice for the control intervention might have obscured greater differences on the LAPAQ between ParkFit patients and controls. We chose to refer patients in the control arm to a physiotherapist who aimed to improve the safety of movements, but without emphasizing the volume of physical activities. This approach helped to maintain blinding of patients with respect to treatment allocation. An additional reason for having a physiotherapy program as control intervention was that abstaining control patients from physiotherapy for two years was considered unethical, in light of growing evidence for the effectiveness of specific physiotherapy interventions.

Furthermore, the ParkFit study took place in the ‘real world’, and physiotherapy in PD is ‘usual care’, not only in the Netherlands (where at least 60% of PD patients receives physiotherapy annually) but also in the United Kingdom. Although no effect was found on the primary outcome, two of our secondary outcomes did pick up an increase in physical activities, as measured both subjectively (activity diary) and objectively (activity monitors). Based on the diary, ParkFit patients spent almost 1.5 hour per week extra on physical activity, compared to baseline. This differed significantly from controls, who increased their level of physical activity by 30 minutes compared to baseline. This amount of increase in physical activity, as observed with the diary, is comparable with findings in elderly populations and patients with other chronic conditions. For example, behavioral counseling for elderly in primary care yielded a one-hour increase in moderate-intensity physical activity. In addition, pedometer-based counseling programs increased total physical activity of cardiac patients by almost 1.5 hour/week. Both the LAPAQ and the diary are subjective instruments, but only the diary showed increased activity levels. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is the fact that the diary merely includes strenuous activities, while the LAPAQ questionnaire reflects the net sum of all physical activities (including household activities). Therefore, we cannot exclude that a possible increase in (strenuous) outdoor and sport activities for ParkFit patients was offset by a concurrent decrease in household activities. The LAPAQ cannot capture such differential effects on specific physical activities as it merely measures the net sum of all physical activities. We therefore regard our decision to select overall physical activity as primary outcome as a shortcoming in the study design, and this aspect should be addressed in future research in this area.

Objective assessment of physical activity using a tri-axial accelerometer showed an increase in physical activities for ParkFit patients, with a 12% increase in time spent to physical activity after 24 months. Generally, accelerometers underestimate total energy expenditure, because some activities are difficult to detect. This includes upper body movements, specific activities such as cycling, and relatively static movements such as gardening or strength training. On the other hand, accelerometers as used in our study can reliably measure activities such as indoor and outdoor walking. The accelerometers thus measured a different aspect of physical activity as compared to the LAPAQ, and this could explain the difference in outcome with the LAPAQ. Compliance with use of the accelerometers was good, suggesting it is a feasible surrogate outcome in future studies. The two remaining secondary outcomes aimed at finding possible health benefits. Physical fitness showed a small but significant difference in favor of ParkFit, but quality of life did not differ between the ParkFit and control intervention. The ParkFit intervention had no major adverse effects. We were concerned about possibly increased fall rates, because the amount of physical activity is associated with a greater risk of falling. However, the ParkFit program was not associated with more falls or injuries. In fact, controls reported eight hip fractures, while ParkFit patients reported only two. However, these numbers are very small, and this finding is coincidental as we did not include hip fractures as primary or secondary outcome. Therefore, further research should investigate whether this difference in hip fractures is related to the intervention. Another concern included cardiovascular complications, due to more strenuous activities. All participants received a sports health assessment prior to participation. We observed two cardiovascular deaths in the ParkFit group, but these were unrelated to exercise. Other adverse effects were comparable between both groups. Taken together, this suggest that ParkFit was a safe intervention, but that the program needs to be adjusted to achieve more substantial increases in physical activity that translate into tangible health improvements.

Our experience with this ParkFit study was a lesson in trial design in this newly emerging field. Although the primary outcome was negative, we have shown the possibility of an exercise based trial in disabled people. Several features set the ParkFit study apart compared to previous exercise studies: the prolonged follow-up, showing that patients in both arms were able to comply with the intervention for two years; the careful matching of treatment intensity between both study arms; the large sample size, making the ParkFit trial by far the largest study on physical activity in PD and other chronic diseases; and the excellent follow-up rate. The feasibility of the study was supported by the ParkinsonNet infrastructure, a nationwide network of allied health professionals who are specialized in PD. A generic challenge for trials aiming to
evaluate the merits of allied health treatment is the lack of expertise among therapists who deliver the trial intervention, creating undesirable variability and insufficient contrast with the control arm. Having expert therapists within ParkinsonNet greatly facilitates the delivery of a relatively uniform intervention according to treatment guidelines. 241-257 As discussed above, our study also highlights the challenges of selecting the appropriate outcomes for a complex intervention such as a behavioural change program. Physical activity is a complex behavior: it includes sports as well as non-sports activities, and it can be characterized by purpose (occupational or leisure), type (cycling, fitness or soccer), intensity (light, moderate or vigorous) and duration. Further research should focus on comprehensive, valid and reliable instruments to accurately measure all these aspects of physical activity behavior. This is a specific challenge in patients with chronic diseases as they perform more light and moderate activities that are easily overestimated when using questionnaires, and which are difficult to detect with activity monitors. Furthermore, our trial revealed new insights in the risk of selection bias. Our participants were on average less sedentary compared with patients who declined to participate. 59 Hence, those who needed to promote their physical activities most refused participation. It therefore remains unclear whether the effects found here can be generalized to more sedentary PD patients. We can neither extend our findings to patients with severe apathy, severe cognitive impairment or depression, because these were excluded. Finally, the ParkFit program was a multifaceted intervention, with coaches using behavioural change techniques, ambulatory feedback devices, and peer pressure from group exercises. Future work should decide which of these components is most effective, and if any component is also effective when used alone.

We conclude that ParkFit, a multifaceted behavioural change program, does not change the overall volume of physical activities in older, sedentary PD patients. However, analysis of the secondary outcomes did suggest greater participation in specific elements of physical activity, and demonstrated an improved fitness among ParkFit patients. These results for the secondary outcomes suggest that it may be worthwhile to replicate a similar behavioural change study, for example with the secondary outcomes as primary parameters. Such a trial may also put more focus on quality of life and cost aspects.
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EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARKFIT PROGRAM:
A MULTIFACETED INTERVENTION AIMED TO PROMOTE PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN PATIENTS WITH PARKINSON’S DISEASE
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ABSTRACT
BACKGROUND
We recently completed the ParkFit study, a two-year randomized controlled trial including 586 sedentary PD patients, that evaluated a multifaceted intervention (ParkFit program) to promote physical activity. Analysis of the secondary outcomes suggested greater participation in specific elements of physical activity, and demonstrated an improved fitness among ParkFit patients. Therefore, further implementation of the program could now be considered. To facilitate this process, we here evaluate the implementation of the ParkFit program.

METHODS
The ParkFit program was evaluated in three ways: (a) experiences of patients and physiotherapists, as investigated using interviews and questionnaires; (b) factors associated with changed activity levels; and (c) subgroup analyses to identify differential effects in subgroups of patients based on baseline physical activity level, age, gender, disease severity, disease duration, and mobility.

RESULTS
The ParkFit program was well received: 73% of patients indicated they would recommend the program to other patients, and 90% of physiotherapists indicated they wanted to use the ParkFit program in other patients. The program was effective in almost all subgroups. In women, most sedentary patients and patients with lower disease severity, the estimated effect size was largest.

CONCLUSION
We conclude that the ParkFit program was effective in almost all specific subgroups. Therapists and patients experienced no major hurdles. This knowledge can be used for further implementation into everyday clinical practice to revert the sedentary behavior of patients with PD, and perhaps other chronic conditions as well.

INTRODUCTION
Patients with PD are less active compared with controls, and this physical activity worsens with disease progression.17 Reversing sedentary lifestyles could have various generic benefits, including increased survival20 21 and lower risks of chronic diseases as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and cancer.22 Promoting physical activity may also improve specific symptoms of PD, such as insomnia, depression, and constipation.22 23 Moreover, rodent work suggests that physical activity may counter neurodegeneration in experimental parkinsonism.22 24 This observation has fueled speculation that physical activity might be used to alter the course of PD in humans.

Many patients are well aware of these potential benefits, but changing a sedentary lifestyle is difficult. Simply knowing about the importance of physical activity is not enough to initiate and maintain an adequate physical activity level on a regular basis, and it proves tremendously difficult to give up unhealthy behavior.24 Changing one’s lifestyle when old or suffering from a chronic disease such as PD is even harder due to physical limitations (e.g. gait and balance impairment) and mental changes (e.g. depression, apathy and cognitive impairment).

Considerable research has aimed to develop tools for clinicians to enable such high-risk groups to successfully change their lifestyle. Several physical activity promotion programs have shown to be effective, these programs were based on healthy behavior theories, used behavioral change strategies and were individually tailored.24-26 Such a specific intervention program that considered the complexity of PD and that addressed all possible barriers was not available until recently. Therefore, we developed the ParkFit program, an individually tailored and disease-specific program for patients with PD. In a multicentre, randomized controlled trial including 586 sedentary PD patients, the ParkFit program was compared with a matched physiotherapy intervention according to the evidence based guideline.27 The ParkFit program was solely delivered by experienced physiotherapists who participate in the Dutch ParkinsonNet.28 In total, 116 physiotherapists offered the ParkFit program to 299 patients.

Although the primary analysis of the ParkFit trial showed no differences in levels of activity, our secondary outcomes showed increased physical activity and improved fitness, without causing more falls (van Nimwegen M and Speelman AD et al., BMJ 2012, in press). Stimulated by these findings, further implementation of the ParkFit program into clinical practice could now be considered. To facilitate this potential implementation process, we here evaluate the implementation of the ParkFit program. Specifically, our analyses focused on: (a) experiences of therapists and patients with the ParkFit program; (b) factors associated with changed activity levels; and (c) subgroup analyses, to identify whether specific subgroups of patients might benefit less or more from the ParkFit program.
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METHODS

THE PARKFIT STUDY

This study was part of the ParkFit study, a randomized controlled multi-centre trial aiming to increase physical activity levels over a course of two years in sedentary PD patients (van Nimwegen M and Speelman AD et al., BMJ 2012, in press). Patient characteristics were presented in Table 8.1. Ethical approval has been granted for the study and all patients signed informed consent. The full study protocol has been described elsewhere.87

PARKFIT PROGRAM

The Parkfit program was specifically designed to achieve a sustained increase in the level of physical activity and was based both on theories and models of behavioral change88 225 and on behavioral change techniques with proven effectiveness.120 237 239

Activity Coach

Physiotherapists served as personal activity coaches who guided patients towards a more active lifestyle during monthly personal coaching sessions. Physiotherapists educated patients about the beneficial effects of physical activity and about suitable activities. Additionally, patients were stimulated to participate in group exercise to experience beneficial effects of physical activity and to receive social support from fellow patients.

Education & Health contract

Patients received an educational workbook covering specific elements to promote a behavioral change. This brochure gave information about the benefits of physical activity and the risks of a sedentary lifestyle. Furthermore, suitable activities for PD patients, strategies to identify and overcome barriers to engage in physical activity, setting goals and recruiting social support were covered. The workbook included a health contract, a written agreement between patient and physiotherapist to support patients in initiating and maintaining physical activities by formulating long term activity goals. Additionally, a logbook was included to monitor short term goals. Patients received a bi-annual newsletter accentuating the benefits of physical activity.

Goal setting

During the coaching sessions patients and physiotherapists formulated activity goals. These goals were created in order to obtain the long term goals as formulated in the health contract. During the coaching sessions patient and therapists evaluated these goals as well as the experienced barriers. The formulated activity goals had to be realistic, concrete and individualized and had to be formulated in a systematic way.

Activity Monitor

All patients received a personal ambulatory monitor.262 This triaxial accelerometer was able to show the amount of actually delivered daily physical activity using light-emitting diodes. At a personalized website, patient and coach could formulate a personal goal based on kilocalories; feedback of the monitor was directly related to this personal goal. Since data of the monitor were uploaded to this website, patient and coach could monitor the individual progress.262

Physiotherapy

The ParkFit program also included regular physiotherapy sessions. Based on individual disabilities, the therapist and patient jointly formulated individually tailored treatment aims, according to the evidence-based guideline of physiotherapy for PD.99

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARKFIT PROGRAM

We took several steps to enable a successful implementation of the ParkFit program. We first developed a specific handbook for physiotherapists, including: (a) information about the benefits and risks of physical activity; (b) information about the process of behavioral change; (c) specific user-information for the tools included in the ParkFit program (health contract, activity monitor); and (d) a scheme including each coaching session, to help therapists through the coaching sessions.

Second, we developed the educational workbook for patients which included all elements of the Parkfit program. This workbook was not only intended to inform patients, but also to guide therapists in dealing with all specific elements important for behavioral change.

Third, physiotherapists were trained to treat patients in the ParkFit program during three educational sessions. These sessions covered the following items: (a) models and theories of behavioral change; (b) general strategies to coach people and to help them to overcome barriers; (c) techniques to formulate realistic, concrete and individualized goals; and (d) how to cope with differences in character between patient and therapist, because this greatly influences behavior.

The specific elements included in the ParkFit program were also explained, such as use of the Activity Monitor, the educational workbook, the logbook and the health contract.

During the two-year intervention period, therapists could consult the research team at any time for advice. Moreover, the research team contacted therapists every three months by telephone to investigate whether they experienced barriers in delivering the ParkFit program.

Finally, after one year, an evaluation meeting with therapists was scheduled. These meetings aimed to refresh the knowledge of the various ParkFit elements and to discuss therapists’ experiences.
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**Experiences**

Therapists were interviewed by four independent researchers three to six months after the start of the intervention. This telephone interview included various aspects related to the ParkFit program. Immediately after ending their participation in the trial, therapists and patients were asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire with questions regarding patients’ and therapists’ opinions about the program.

**Factors associated with changed activity levels**

In the ParkFit study, the level of physical activity was primary measured with the LAPAQ questionnaire. The LAPAQ questionnaire reflects the net sum of 'outdoor and sport activities' plus 'household activities'. Post hoc analyses of the ParkFit trial showed that a significant and possibly relevant increase (24%) in outdoor and sport activities for ParkFit patients was offset by a concurrent decrease in household activities. Here, we identified variables that could be associated with this change in ‘outdoor physical activity’ as measured with the LAPAQ.

The following variables were evaluated: disease severity (Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale motor part (UPDRS III), Hoehn and Yahr stage (HY))

- disease duration (years), quality of life (Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39)), mobility (Timed Up and Go test (TUG)),

- bradykinesia (Nine hole pegboard test, (NHPT)), fatigue (Fatigue Severity Scale (FSS)), anxiety and depression (Hospitality Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS)),

- physical fitness (6-minute walk test (6MWT)), and levodopa equivalent dose (mg).

Moreover, general characteristics as body mass index (BMI), gender, age, and marital status were assessed.

**Subgroup analyses**

In an exploratory setting, the effectiveness of the ParkFit program was evaluated in specific subgroups. Subgroups were defined based on baseline physical activity level, age, gender, disease severity (UPDRS III), disease duration, and mobility (TUG). For each variable we classified two subgroups based on the median of the whole group.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSES**

Descriptive statistics were used to present quantitative data (i.e. means and percentages). Univariate linear regression analyses were performed to study associations between the change in level of physical activity during the entire follow-up period (i.e. mean of 6, 12, 18 and 24 months) and the possible variables (assessed at baseline). Variables that contributed significantly were included in a forward multivariate linear regression analysis. Because the physical activity level was skewed, medians and interquartile ranges were presented, and analyses were performed after logarithmic transformation. Furthermore, linear regression analyses were performed to determine differences in subgroups for changes in level of physical activity, changes in quality of life (i.e. mean of 6, 12, 18 and 24 months), and changes in physical fitness (i.e. mean of 12 and 24 months) between both interventions. Fixed factors were treatment arm, score at baseline (level of physical activity, quality of life or physical fitness), H&Y stage, age, and gender.

**RESULTS**

**EXPERIENCES**

**Physiotherapists**

Out of 116 therapists, 113 (97%) were interviewed. The mean number of patients treated by each therapist was 2.4 (range 1 – 13). Therapists identified patients’ physical limitations (63%), uncertainty about their abilities and fear of falling (41%), and declined cognition (41%) as the most important explanations for their lifestyle.

Nearly all therapists (96%) felt competent to offer the specific ParkFit intervention. Only 1% of therapists believed that their knowledge of behavioral change was not sufficient. Seventy-eight percent was able to deliver the program always or very often. Main reasons for not succeeding were: patients’ co-morbidity, cognitive disturbances, patients’ lack of motivation, and increased disease severity. Formulating concrete and smart activity goals was difficult according to the therapists; patients’ physical limitations and cognitive decline were the main reasons for difficulties in goal setting. Most therapists (96%) considered that their patients were motivated to participate in the ParkFit program.

Ninety-three percent completed the questionnaire at the end of the study. Therapists reported education (94%) and the coaching sessions (93%) as the main tools of the ParkFit program (Table 8.2). Most therapists (91%) said they would apply the ParkFit program in other patients with a sedentary lifestyle; 89% would offer the program to other PD patients. Twenty-one therapists (15%) mentioned suggestions to improve the program.

**Patients**

Out of 299 patients, 255 (85%) completed the questionnaire. Almost all patients (90%) reported they perceived benefits due to the intervention. Seventy-three percent percent was certainly recommend the program to other patients with PD, and 21% would consider recommending the program. The most popular tool for patients was the Activity Monitor; 83% of patients identified this device as a (very) useful instrument (Table 8.2).

**FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH CHANGED ACTIVITY LEVELS**

Lower age, longer disease duration, better mobility, and lower baseline levels of physical activity were associated with larger changes in physical activity (Table 8.3). Multiple forward regression analysis resulted in a model with two variables: less baseline physical activity, and better mobility were associated with larger changes in levels of physical activity ($R^2=38\%$) (Table 8.3).
TABLE 8.1
BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ParkFit (n = 299)</th>
<th>Controls (n = 287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics &amp; Clinical Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>65.1 (7.9)</td>
<td>65.9 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>194 (65%)</td>
<td>188 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>27.4 (4.5)</td>
<td>27.6 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration (years)</td>
<td>5.0 (4.5)</td>
<td>5.5 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMSE</td>
<td>28.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>28.1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Hoehn and Yahr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7 (2.3%)</td>
<td>10 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>221 (73.9%)</td>
<td>223 (77.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>48 (16.1%)</td>
<td>36 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16 (5.4%)</td>
<td>14 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>33.1 (11.3)</td>
<td>32.3 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily levodopa equivalent dose (mg)</td>
<td>458 (362)</td>
<td>499 (414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of physical activity (hours per week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPAQ total</td>
<td>12.8 (8.3 - 20.3)</td>
<td>13.8 (8.3 - 23.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPAQ outdoor and sport activities</td>
<td>5.7 (3.0 - 10.3)</td>
<td>6.0 (5.0 - 10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPAQ household activities</td>
<td>5.0 (2.0 - 10.7)</td>
<td>5.3 (2.0 - 13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data reflect mean (SD), median (IQR-range) or number (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8.2
PERCENTAGES OF BOTH PATIENTS AND THERAPISTS WHO CLASSIFIED THE ELEMENTS OF THE PARKFIT PROGRAM AS USEFUL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients (n=250)</th>
<th>Physiotherapists (n=108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting (short term)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting (long term)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching sessions</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Monitor</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport sessions</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8.3
REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS (%) AND 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES BETWEEN THE CHANGE IN PHYSICAL ACTIVITY (LAPAQ OUTDOOR AND SPORT ACTIVITIES) AND THE EXPLORATORY FACTORS MEASURED AT BASELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Univariate regression (95% CIs)</th>
<th>Multivariate regression (95% CIs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of physical activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPAQ outdoor and sport activities</td>
<td>-43.8 (-47.3, -40.1)*</td>
<td>-44.8 (-48.3, -41.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.6 (-2.7, -0.5)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (men = 0)</td>
<td>-12.7 (-26.7, 3.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner (no partner = 0)</td>
<td>5.1 (-16.2, 21.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>0.0 (-2.1, 1.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disease characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Hoehn and Yahr</td>
<td>-12.5 (-32.4, 13.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDRS III</td>
<td>-0.6 (-1.4, 0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration (y)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.2, 3.9)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily levodopa equivalent dose (mg)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional clinical characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6MWT</td>
<td>0.1 (0, 0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>-2.5 (-4.9, -0.1)*</td>
<td>-4.7 (-6.5, -2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ-39</td>
<td>0.1 (0.5, 0.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPT</td>
<td>0.3 (0.5, 1.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>-1.1 (-4.3, 3.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADS</td>
<td>0.2 (-1.1, 1.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPA night</td>
<td>0.8 (-1.6, 3.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPA day</td>
<td>0.4 (-2.1, 2.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAPAQ = LASA Physical Activity Questionnaire. BMI = Body Mass Index (kg/m²). UPDRS III = Unified Parkinson’s disease rating scale part III. 6MWT = 6-minute walk test. TUG = Timed up and Go test. PDQ-39 = Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire. NHPT = nine hole peg board test. FSS = Fatigue Severity Scale. HADS = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale.
### Table 8.4

**Effect sizes of the primary and secondary outcome measures in all patients and for subgroups of patients between ParkFit and controls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in Physical activity</th>
<th>Change in Quality of Life</th>
<th>Change in Physical Fitness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All patients</td>
<td>24% (10% to 40%)*</td>
<td>-0.9 (-2.1 to 0.3)</td>
<td>4.8 (0.1 to 9.6)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroups of patients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 67</td>
<td>17% (-1% to 38%)</td>
<td>-1.0 (-2.6 to 0.6)</td>
<td>6.1 (-7.3 to 19.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 67</td>
<td>38% (13% to 68%)*</td>
<td>-0.8 (-2.6 to 1.0)</td>
<td>17.0 (2.6 to 31.4)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>19% (3% to 37%)*</td>
<td>-0.8 (-2.2 to 0.6)</td>
<td>9.1 (-2.8 to 20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>40% (10% to 80%)*</td>
<td>-0.6 (-2.7 to 1.6)</td>
<td>12.0 (-4.4 to 28.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disease duration (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3.75</td>
<td>27% (5% to 54%)*</td>
<td>-1.4 (-3.0 to 0.3)</td>
<td>15.9 (2.7 to 29.0)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3.75</td>
<td>23% (3% to 47%)*</td>
<td>0.13 (-1.6 to 1.9)</td>
<td>4.6 (-9.5 to 18.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disease severity (UPDRS III)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 32</td>
<td>24% (3% to 51%)*</td>
<td>-1.7 (-3.3 to -0.05)*</td>
<td>15.0 (1.7 to 28.4)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 32</td>
<td>30% (9% to 55%)*</td>
<td>-0.2 (-1.9 to 1.6)</td>
<td>7.4 (-6.5 to 21.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility (TUG, seconds)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 9.25</td>
<td>28% (7% to 52%)*</td>
<td>-1.2 (-2.8 to 0.4)</td>
<td>10.5 (-0.8 to 21.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 9.25</td>
<td>21% (-0.1% to 46%)</td>
<td>-0.3 (-2.2 to 1.5)</td>
<td>9.3 (-6.0 to 24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline physical activity (hours)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 6</td>
<td>34% (10% to 64%)*</td>
<td>-0.2 (-2.1 to 1.4)</td>
<td>1.0 (-13.5 to 15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6</td>
<td>17% (-0.1% to 38%)</td>
<td>-1.3 (-2.9 to 0.3)</td>
<td>18.3 (5.5 to 31.1)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reflect estimated differences and 95% confidence intervals; analyses were corrected for age, gender, H&Y, and baseline level; *without correction for age; **without correction for gender; *p < 0.05. Physical activity was measured with the LASA Physical Activity Questionnaire (LAPAQ); quality of life was measured with the Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39); physical fitness was measured with the 6-minute walk test (6MWT). UPDRS III – motor part of the Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale; TUG – Timed up and Go test.

---

### Discussion

We aimed to evaluate the trial experience with the ParkFit program, as a basis to facilitate future implementation into clinical practice. Both therapists and patients were positive about the intervention. Almost all therapists wished to use the ParkFit program in other patients, and 73% of patients would recommend the program to other patients. Subgroup analyses revealed that the program was effective in almost all subgroups. The most sedentary patients, women, patients with lower disease severity, shorter disease duration and elderly patients appeared to benefit relatively most.

The different elements of the ParkFit program were offered as a ‘total package’ to achieve a behavioral change. Since therapists were educated to offer this multifaceted program and we evaluated the program likewise, we cannot conclude whether specific elements were more or less effective. However, the results of the questionnaire gave some insight in the perceived success of the various components. Specifically, therapists reported education and the coaching sessions as main tools of the ParkFit program, while most patients reported the Activity Monitor as the most useful tool. Clearly, these three elements deserve optimal attention when delivering the ParkFit program in clinical practice. Future work is needed to decide which component is most effective in increasing physical activity levels, and if any component of the ParkFit program will also be effective when used in isolation.

The program had an excellent compliance: 85% of patients in the ParkFit program completed the total intervention (van Nimwegen M and Speelman AD et al., BMJ 2012, in press). Our results concerning adherence are comparable with previous short-term programs (up to 6 months) but remarkably higher compared with previous long-term programs (up to 14 months). In an exercise program of six months aiming to reduce fall risk in PD, 54% of patients completed at least 75% of the sessions. Another study of group exercise in PD found an attendance rate of 73% during 14 months. Several aspects of our program could have contributed to its high adherence. First, the individually tailored character of the intervention – with activities that participants enjoyed – makes participation more palatable compared with exercise in general.

---

**Table 8.4**

**EFFECT SIZES OF THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY OUTCOME MEASURES IN ALL PATIENTS AND FOR SUBGROUPS OF PATIENTS BETWEEN PARKFIT AND CONTROLS**

The ParkFit program was effective in changing the level of physical activity in almost all subgroups, except for patients younger than 67, patients with lower mobility scores and more physically active patients at baseline (Table 8.4). The estimated difference between ParkFit and controls was largest in the most sedentary patients (estimated group difference 34%, 95% Confidence Interval [CI] 10 to 64%), women (40%, CI=10 to 80%), and patients older than 67 (38%, CI=13 to 68%) (Table 8.4). The ParkFit program was effective in changing physical fitness in different subgroups (Table 8.4). Quality of life changed only in patients with lower disease severity (-1.7, CI=-3.4 to -0.05%) (Table 8.4).
Since patient and therapist jointly chose one or more (sport) activities, patients were allowed to follow their own wishes, adjusted to the individual situation. Second, the disease-specific knowledge of the therapists could explain the high adherence. The intervention was delivered solely by experienced physiotherapists participating in the Dutch ParkinsonNet. ParkinsonNet networks were specifically developed to improve the PD-specific expertise of health professionals, and to increase patient volumes per therapists. Probably, due to these specific elements, therapists were able to adequately anticipate on perceived barriers of PD patients, and this could have improved patients’ adherence. Most patients who withdrew from the intervention did so just after baseline inclusion (4.7%). After about six months, another 5% of patients had stopped with the program. Apparently, once patients participate and perceive no ‘starting’ problems, there are hardly no reasons to stop with the intervention. This suggests that the program is feasible and achievable for patients. Besides the excellent compliance of patients, almost all involved therapists delivered the intervention for two years and completed both the interview and the questionnaire. This shows great enthusiasm and interest with the ParkFit program.

Multivariate regression showed that larger changes in levels of physical activity were associated with less baseline physical activity. The major part of the explained variance was explained by baseline physical activity. This could be a simple regression to the mean effect, but it could also suggest that poor daily participation in exercise is no reason to withhold patients a physical activity program such as ParkFit. Furthermore, better mobility was associated with greater increases in physical activity after two years. Moreover, therapists reported that patients without comorbidities and cognitive disturbances were more easy to stimulate towards an active lifestyle. Therefore, physiotherapists should take poor baseline mobility, physical limitations, baseline physical activity levels, and cognitive functioning of patients into account before starting a behavioral change program, for example by engaging the immediate caregiver into the program. Perhaps, patients should receive treatment (e.g. by increasing dopaminergic medication, or by offering physiotherapy strategies such as cueing) prior to participation.

Subgroup analyses showed significant differences for almost all subgroups between patients in the ParkFit program and controls. In the subgroups of women, patients with lower disease severity and patients with a shorter disease duration, the benefits from the ParkFit program seem to greater. However, these results should be interpreted with caution, because the study was not set up to compare subgroups and had insufficient power to reliably detect differences. As such, the present results serve only as hypothesis-generating, which call for further confirmation in new studies. This work could focus on some promising hypotheses that came from our current research, suggesting that specific subgroups may benefit more than others. Specifically, further research should focus on the effects of ParkFit-like interventions in women, patients with lower disease severity and patients with a shorter disease duration.

The ParkFit program was now offered solely by physiotherapists with PD-specific expertise, which likely helped to overcome any barriers imposed by the physical limitations. The question is whether adding professionals from other disciplines might help to improve the quality of the behavioral change program. One example that came from the interviews was a psychologist, who could address the cognitive issues associated with PD, but who also adds specific expertise to change behavior. One could also consider adding sport instructors, since they have specific knowledge about coaching, counseling, sports and exercise. It will be interesting to examine the possible role of such sport instructors within the ParkFit program. For example, we anticipate that patients with greater disease severity will require more specific knowledge of a specialized physiotherapist, while patients in earlier stages could be coached solely by a sport instructor.

**CONCLUSION**

Our analysis of the ParkFit program yielded several suggestions for improvement: 1) improve education for therapists with respect to theories about behavioral change; 2) formulate concrete and specific examples of exercise goals; and 3) pay more specific attention to patients with comorbidities, cognitive dysfunction and a lack of motivation during education. Sedentary behavior is a major public health problem, and physical activity can have various specific benefits for patients with PD. We therefore recommend further implementation of this program into everyday clinical practice.
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This chapter summarizes the main findings of this thesis and focused on the assessment and benefits of physical activity in PD and how PD patients can increase their level of physical activity using a multifaceted behavioral change program.

CHAPTER 2
THE BENEFITS AND RISKS OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY
The potential benefits and risks of increased physical activity in PD were explored in Chapter 2. This perspective article identified the following 10 potential benefits of an active lifestyle in PD patients: 1) prevention of cardiovascular complications, 2) slowing or arrest of osteoporosis development, 3) improved cognitive function, 4) prevention or treatment of depression, 5) improved sleep, 6) decreased constipation, 7) decreased fatigue, 8) improved functional motor performance, 9) improved drug efficacy, and 10) optimization of the dopaminergic system (possibly resulting in modification of the disease course). This chapter also concluded that there is still a lack of evidence about the benefits of exercise in patients with PD. Most evidence for the beneficial effects of exercise is on cardiovascular mortality and morbidity, cognitive dysfunction and mood. The best available evidence that supports the avoidance of a sedentary lifestyle is based on studies in healthy individuals and in patients with other neurodegenerative diseases. Besides the benefits of exercise, there could be an increased risk of falls, fall-related fractures, and an increased risk of cardiovascular complications.

Compelling theoretical reasons support the importance of avoiding a sedentary lifestyle and promoting physical activity for patients with, or at risk of developing, PD. However, there is still a lack of adequate knowledge about the benefits of exercise in patients with PD.

CHAPTER 3
PREVALENCE AND RISK FACTORS OF OSTEOPOROSIS
In Chapter 3, one specific health benefit of an active lifestyle was described, which was the positive effect on bone mass. Bone loss is regarded as more common in PD than in the general population. Several factors may be involved in the development of bone loss. Moreover, osteoporosis is an important risk factor for fractures. In Chapter 3, the prevalence of osteoporosis in sedentary PD patients was investigated. Furthermore, the possible risk factors that are associated with bone loss in sedentary patients were studied in 191 PD patients in an early stage of the disease (Hoehn and Yahr stage 1 to 2.5). The results demonstrated that the prevalence of osteoporosis and osteopenia was 53.2% in patients with an early stage of PD. These results were consistent with previous studies about osteoporosis in PD. Female gender, weight loss and
low vitamin D levels were identified as significant risk factors for decreased bone mineral density. Furthermore, vitamin D concentrations were significant lower in comparison with sex and age-matched controls without PD.

Over 50% of sedentary PD patients have an abnormal bone mineral density. Female gender, weight loss and low vitamin D levels were identified as risk factors for decreased bone mineral density in PD.

CHAPTER 4
PATHOPHYSIOLOGY AND TREATMENT OF OSTEOPOROSIS

In this chapter, the pathophysiological mechanisms of bone loss and treatment of osteoporosis were described by reviewing the existing literature. PD patients have a lower bone mineral density compared to age-matched controls. PD patients also have a high risk of falls and – consequently – of sustaining osteoporotic fractures. The reduction of bone mineral density is multifactorial in origin, and includes reduced mobility, vitamin D deficiency, hyperhomocysteinemia (caused by use of levodopa), vitamin B12 or folic acid deficiency, malnutrition or low body weight, and decreased muscle strength. A few studies demonstrated that treatment with bisphosphonates, vitamin D and calcium can increase the bone mineral density in PD patients. Screening for osteoporosis should be considered in PD patients more often and therapeutic interventions should be initiated for those patients with proven osteoporosis. An appropriate treatment of osteoporosis could reduce the risk of fractures in PD patients, but the (cost-)effectiveness of this approach remains to be examined.

CHAPTER 5
AMBULATORY MONITORING

The assessment of physical activity in daily life is complex. Several methods have been proposed to assess physical activity levels or energy expenditure including ambulatory monitors. The use of activity monitors for long-term monitoring of walking distance is still limited. To evaluate whether an ambulatory monitor could estimate walking distance in PD patients, a simple activity monitor (Dynaport activity monitor) was validated in PD patients in Chapter 5. This device measures accelerations of the lower trunk using tri-axial accelerometers and is placed in a belt positioned on the lower back between the posterior superior iliac spines. The results demonstrated that the precision of the activity monitor to estimate short walking distance (ranging between 21 and 27 meters) was good. However, the precision to estimate long walking distances (up to 1097 meters) was less adequate, with a wide range of agreement (-43% to 41%). The use of this monitor for clinical purposes is therefore limited. If this monitor is used as a screening tool, the actual walking distance might be the measured distance plus or minus 40%.

CHAPTER 6
CARDIOVASCULAR RESPONSES IN PD

Patients with PD are physically less active than controls. Autonomic dysfunction may contribute to this sedentary lifestyle. Specifically, an altered cardiovascular response to physical effort may limit physical activities. Therefore, in Chapter 6 the cardiovascular responses to a submaximal exercise test in sedentary PD patients and sedentary controls were assessed. The study demonstrated that PD patients had a lower estimated VO2max compared to controls (22 ml/min/kg versus 33 ml/min/kg). Moreover, more than half of the sedentary PD patients were unable to adequately increase their heart rate during a submaximal exercise test while almost all controls had an adequate heart rate increase. This inadequate increase in heart rate during exercise may be caused cardiac sympathetic denervation leading to autonomic dysfunction. The lower resting heart rate and lower systolic blood pressure observed in those patients may be an additional indication for this symptomatic denervation of the heart.

The accuracy of ambulatory activity monitoring (using tri-axial accelerometers mounted on the lower back) for long walking distances is insufficiently adequate. Therefore, the use of this type of ambulatory monitor for this clinical purpose is limited.
CHAPTER 7
PROMOTION OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

The evidence for the possible positive effects of exercise on several health outcomes indicates that an active lifestyle in PD patients could be beneficial. The sedentary lifestyle observed in patients with PD can be explained by physical limitations and mental changes, warranting an individually tailored, disease-specific physical activity intervention. Chapter 7 describes the ParkFit trial, a multicentre, randomized controlled trial in which a multifaceted, behavioral program, the ParkFit program, was compared with a matched general physiotherapy intervention. The ParkFit program was designed to achieve a sustained increase in the level of physical activity. The intervention was based on theories and models of behavioral change, and on widely used behavioral change techniques with proven effectiveness. Both groups were compared for the change in physical activity over a course of two years (primary outcome LASA physical activity questionnaire (LAPAQ); secondary outcomes of physical activity were a diary and accelerometer). Secondarily the influence of a changed lifestyle on the number of falls, quality of life (PDQ-39) and physical fitness (six minute walk test) was investigated. We included 586 patients, 299 in the ParkFit group and 289 in the control group.

The results showed that the overall time spent in physical activities was comparable between the two groups (difference 7%; confidence interval, -3 to 17%; p=0.19). Three of our secondary outcomes indicated greater physical activity in patients allocated to the ParkFit program. This was demonstrated both subjectively (with activity diaries, difference 30%; p<0.001) and objectively (with an ambulatory activity monitor, difference 12%; p<0.001). Moreover, physical fitness increased in ParkFit patients, but not in controls (difference 4.8 meters; p=0.05). Quality of life did not differ between ParkFit and controls (difference -0.9 points; p=0.14). The number of patients with one or more falls was comparable in both groups: 184 (62%) in ParkFit and 191 (67%) in controls.

Our study showed that the ParkFit behavioural change program did not increase overall physical activity, as measured with the LAPAQ. Analysis of the secondary endpoints justifies further work into the possible merits of behavioural change programs to increase physical activities in daily life. The ParkFit program improved fitness over a 2-year period, without causing more falls.

CHAPTER 8
EVALUATION OF THE BEHAVIORAL CHANGE PROGRAM

The ParkFit program improved physical activities in sedentary PD patients based on positive findings of the secondary outcomes of the ParkFit study (Chapter 7), so implementation in clinical practice seems justified. In Chapter 8, we evaluated elements that are relevant for the future implementation of this program; specifically, we assessed the following three elements: 1) experiences of patients and physiotherapists (investigated using interviews and questionnaires); 2) factors associated with changed physical activity level; and 3) exploratory subgroup analyses to identify differential effects in subgroups of patients based on baseline physical activity level, age, gender, disease severity, disease duration, and mobility.

Data of 255 (85%) patients and 116 (97%) physiotherapists were collected. Both patients and therapists were positive about the intervention. Almost all therapist (90%) wanted to use the ParkFit program in other patients and 73% of patients would recommend the program to other patients. No major hurdles were reported for further implementation. The most important suggestions included a need for (more) education about coaching and behavioral change techniques, and (more) advice about increasing physical activity in specific groups of patients (i.e. patients with e.g. co-morbidities).

Less baseline physical activity and better mobility were associated with larger changes in physical activity over two years (R^2=48%). Exploratory subgroup analyses revealed that the program was effective in almost all subgroups. In women, most sedentary patients, and patients with lower disease severity, the estimated size was largest.

The ParkFit program was effective in almost all specific subgroups. Therapists and patients experienced no major hurdles for further implementation. This knowledge can be used for further implementation into everyday clinical practice.
CHAPTER 10
GENERAL DISCUSSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES
Several issues related to physical activity and exercise in PD have been answered by the studies described in this thesis. Below, these results are discussed and placed into a broader context. It is clear that there are still many areas of uncertainty that require further research, and some suggestions for this research agenda are also given below.

**IS PHYSICAL ACTIVITY EFFECTIVE FOR PD PATIENTS?**

Although the number of studies on exercise or physical activity increases, there is still a lack of evidence about the benefits of exercise in patients with PD, as described in Chapter 2. The most recent exercise studies provided some evidence in support of exercise programs in PD. A six-week treadmill intervention in 20 patients with PD showed improvements in fatigue and quality of life, but not in walking capacity, as compared to a control group (usual care with advice to maintain current levels of physical activity). Executive function improved in a group of 19 PD patients directly after 30 minutes passive leg cycling. Furthermore, a review of forced exercise in animal models and preliminary data on humans with PD has become available, underscoring the potential of forced exercise to influence cognition, metabolism, and, potentially, the progression of neurodegenerative disease.

In general elderly populations, physical activity and exercise are associated with improved bone health. The effect of exercise on bone mass in patients with PD has not yet been studied (Chapter 2 and 4). There is an indication for a complex interaction between various factors that can contribute to bone loss in PD. Optimal management of osteoporosis calls for an extensive risk assessment of all of these factors, including medication use, level of immobilization, muscle strength and nutritional status. Furthermore, the high incidence of vitamin D deficiency is particularly interesting (Chapter 3). Until now, the influence of vitamin D deficiency on the pathogenesis of PD or the possibility that PD itself leads to vitamin D deficiency is not clearly understood. However, it is important to be aware of vitamin D deficiency in PD patients, because of the possible effects on bone mineral density and muscle strength. Therefore, pending further evidence, it would appear prudent to perform regular measurements of vitamin D in older PD patients, starting early on in the course of their disease. Treatment of osteoporosis should be similar as for non-parkinsonian patients with osteoporosis and osteopenia and should start with bisphosphonates, vitamin D and an adequate intake of calcium. Furthermore, the general benefits of physical activity on bone loss in healthy adults can also be expected in PD patients. The question is if the high-impact exercises, that are effective in adults in combination with weight-bearing exercises, are also suitable for PD patients because of their high risk of falling. This now needs to be taken to the test.
The lack of evidence for health outcomes in the ParkFit study could possibly be explained by a lack of compliance. Furthermore, in the ParkFit study the relationship between physical activity and specific health benefits was investigated in a post hoc analysis. Small but statically significant correlations were found between the change in level of physical activity and changes in mobility, quality of life, and disease severity: the subgroup of patients with the greatest increase in physical activity also showed better quality of life, lower disease severity scores and relatively greater mobility. The observed increase in outdoor activities and sports was 24%, but in terms of health benefits only physical fitness significantly increased. These findings support the hypothesis that physical activity is accompanied by health benefits. However, the results have to be interpreted with caution since the direction of these relations is unclear: for example, patients with only minimal changes in disease severity could have been able to increase physical activity more easily.

The aim of the ParkFit study (Chapter 7) was to increase the level of physical activity in sedentary PD patients. Overall time spent on physical activities (measured with the LAPAQ) was comparable between patients in the ParkFit program and patients allocated to the control intervention. The LAPAQ yields a total sum score for outdoor and household activities, more detailed post hoc analyses of the nature of the physical activities showed that ParkFit patients significantly increased their outdoor activities (difference 24%; confidence interval 10 to 40%; p<0.001), while they reduced their household activities (difference 16%; confidence interval -27 to -3%; p=0.02). As a result, the net volume of indoor and outdoor activities was not significantly different between both groups. The question is whether PD patients who increased their outdoor activities, actually reduced their household activities. Several aspects could explain this observation. First, the time spent on household activities was really reduced in ParkFit patients because they spent more time outdoors. Alternatively, it is possible that patients who became more active outdoors no longer regarded household activities as physical activities, leading to underreport. Regardless, ParkFit patients did increase their outdoor activities, and this was a welcome finding as outdoor activities are likely associated with greater aerobic challenges.

Furthermore, in the ParkFit study the relationship between physical activity and specific health benefits was investigated in a post hoc analysis. Small but statistically significant correlations were found between the change in level of physical activity and changes in mobility, quality of life, and disease severity: the subgroup of patients with the greatest increase in physical activity also showed better quality of life, lower disease severity scores and relatively greater mobility. The observed increase in outdoor activities and sports was 24%, but in terms of health benefits only physical fitness significantly increased. These findings support the hypothesis that physical activity is accompanied by health benefits. However, the results have to be interpreted with caution since the direction of these relations is unclear: for example, patients with only minimal changes in disease severity could have been able to increase physical activity more easily.

The lack of evidence for health outcomes in the ParkFit study could possibly be explained by a low intensity of activities. Patients become more active, but probably the intensity of the activities is not sufficient for health benefits to be picked up. There is evidence that aerobic physical activities which improve cardiorespiratory fitness are beneficial for cognitive function in healthy older adults. The question is whether PD patients can continue to participate in intensive aerobic physical activities for prolonged periods of time, and whether such greater efforts will translate into tangible clinical effects. Furthermore, if intensive aerobic activities are required to examine these effects, PD patients must be able to increase their heart rate during physical effort. The question is whether this is suitable for every PD patient, in light of their inadequate heart rate increase during submaximal exercise as described in Chapter 6. Another concern is that PD patients become only partially more physically active (by example, participating in fitness classes for two hours a week), but during the rest of the time such patients may still spend a lot of time being sedentary, which in turn is related to all-cause cardiovascular disease and mortality.

The assessment of physical activity in daily life is complex. Several methods have been proposed to assess physical activity levels or energy expenditure including questionnaires, diaries and ambulatory monitors. In the ParkFit study, we selected a physical activity questionnaire (LAPAQ) as our primary outcome measure (Chapter 7). This questionnaire is a validated instrument to measure habitual physical activity and as such, it was closely related to the goals of the ParkFit intervention, namely promotion of physical activities. A disadvantage of physical activity questionnaires could be the overestimation of activities or delivery of socially desirable answers by the respondents. People tend to over-report physical activity, for example household activities, and to underestimate sedentary activities like watching television. The ParkFit study showed that a multifaceted behavioural change program does not promote overall physical activities in sedentary PD patients, as measured with LAPAQ. However, two of our secondary outcomes did suggest greater physical activity in patients allocated to the ParkFit program. This was demonstrated both subjectively (with activity diaries) and objectively (with an ambulatory activity monitor). Both the LAPAQ and the diary are subjective instruments, but only the diary showed increased activity levels. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is the fact that the diary merely includes strenuous activities, while the LAPAQ questionnaire reflects the net sum of all physical activities (including household activities). However, it was reassuring to see that the post hoc findings from our primary outcome (namely an increased time spent on outdoor and sport activities, with a 24% difference in favor of ParkFit patients compared to controls) were confirmed by these two secondary outcome measures, both in terms of direction of the effect (showing benefits for the ParkFit group) and magnitude of the effect (expressed as a percentage difference). Specifically, the activity monitor showed a 12% difference in favor of ParkFit, and the activity diary showed a 30% difference in favor of ParkFit.

Overall, this study shows (again) that physical activity is a complex behavior: it includes sports as well as non-sports activities and it can be characterized by purpose (occupational or leisure), type (cycling, fitness or soccer), intensity (light, moderate or vigorous) and duration. Taken together, the outcomes of the ParkFit study offered converging evidence for a beneficial effect of the ParkFit program on (outdoor) physical activities, but only if the LAPAQ is divided into outdoor and sport activities and household activities. Further research should focus on comprehensive, valid and reliable instruments to accurately measure all of the aspects of
physical activity behavior, specifically in patients with chronic diseases as they perform more light and moderate activities which are easy to overestimate when using questionnaires and difficult to detect with activity monitors.

Activity monitoring has potential as a practical tool to study activity levels in older patients. Many different types of ambulatory monitors are available. In Chapter 5, a simple activity monitor was validated for use as a tool to assess walking distances in PD patients. Specifically, this ambulatory monitor measures accelerations of the lower trunk using tri-axial accelerometers and is placed in a belt positioned on the lower back between the posterior superior iliac spines. The results showed that the ambulatory monitor can be used to measure short walking distances (up to 27 meters), but the tool had a less accurate precision for longer walking distances (up to 1097 meters). Besides accelerometry, Global Positioning Systems (GPS) seem to be a promising approach for understanding physical activity behavior at the population level. Future research is needed on the use of ambulatory monitors in specific groups, such as patients with PD who experience specific types of gait problems (for example, hypokinetic gait, freezing of gait, or dyskinetic gait induced by medication). Furthermore, different types of activities like cycling or more static activities (like weight-bearing exercises or household activities like washing windows) should ideally be assessed using such ambulatory monitors.

In general, age, gender, health status, and fear of falling are associated with exercise behavior. In PD patients, two studies investigated the determinants of physical activity. Self-efficacy was associated with regular exercise in community-dwelling PD patients. Furthermore, physical inactivity was associated with worse walking performance, more disability in daily life, and greater disease severity. In Chapter 8, we tried to identify factors associated with increased activity levels in PD and to identify group(s) of patients who increased their activity level the most. Multivariate regression showed that a larger change in the level of physical activity was strongly associated with the need for a proactive approach towards patients with a very sedentary lifestyle. Once again, this underscores the need for a proactive approach towards patients with a very sedentary lifestyle, and who now declined to participate in the ParkFit study. Although patients with severe apathy, cognitive impairment or depression were not included in the ParkFit study, therapists reported that patients with cognitive disturbances were more difficult to coach towards an active lifestyle. It remains unclear if the ParkFit program is also suitable for these patients. Future research and education of physiotherapists should focus on coaching patients with co-morbidities, cognitive dysfunction and a lack of motivation.

The success of behavioural change programs depends probably not only on the barriers PD patients experience, but also on self-efficacy. Self-efficacy, rather than disability, is strongly associated with whether community-dwelling PD patients exercise regularly. A strength of the
ParkFit study is that not only patients who were highly motivated to increase their physical activity were included, and that the ParkFit program was individually tailored. Future work should now focus on the most effective (individually tailored) programs for PD patients with different barriers and different levels of self-efficacy to become physically active. Physical therapists should include strategies in their coaching to increase self-efficacy and take into account poor baseline mobility, physical limitations, baseline physical activity levels, and cognitive functioning of patients before starting a behavioral change program in PD patients, for example by engaging the immediate caregiver into the program. Perhaps, patients should receive treatment (e.g. by increasing dopaminergic medication, or by offering physiotherapy strategies such as cueing) prior to participation.

The development of appropriate measurements to detect various barriers, including cognitive functioning, to become physically active in PD is needed. Furthermore, future work should also decide which component of the ParkFit program was most effective, and evaluate if any component would also have been effective when used in isolation, and also evaluate which component is most effective in different types of patients.

The ParkFit study is by far one of the largest randomized controlled trials about physical activity in PD patients. Compared with other studies about physical activity, both in PD and other chronic diseases, most available trials have some methodological problems such as a short-term follow-up and a low number of patients. The ParkFit study tackled these problems. What sets the ParkFit study apart is: (1) the long term follow-up period of two years; (2) the large number of participants included in the study; (3) the challenging combination of both physical limitations and cognitive impairments patients with PD are faced with; (4) the pragmatic nature and generalizability of the study; the intervention was delivered by not less than 154 different physiotherapists, and (5) the low dropout rate of 7.7%.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION**

The aim of this thesis was to obtain better insight into the benefits, risks and measurements of physical activity and exercise in PD, and to develop an approach to stimulate PD patients to a sustained, active lifestyle. We have shown that sedentary PD patients were not able to increase their overall level of physical activity with an individualized behavioral change program. However, the secondary endpoints suggest that patient did increased physical activity and improved fitness, without causing more falls. Although the ParkFit program suggest a sustained behavioral change in sedentary PD patients, changing unhealthy behavior still remains a challenge for patients, therapists and researchers. The evidence about the merits of physical activity in patients with PD is still limited. The long-term health benefits of physical activity should be studied in more detail, with a focus on the optimal dosage, intensity, frequency and duration that is needed to achieve clinically meaningful health benefits.
CHAPTER
NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING
HOOFDSTUK 2
DE VOORDELEN EN RISICO’S VAN FYSIEKE
ACTIVITEIT BIJ DE ZIEKTE VAN PARKINSON

In Hoofdstuk 2 zijn de voordelen en risico’s van meer fysieke activiteit bij de ziekte van Parkinson onderzocht. Tien potentiële voordelen van een actieve leefstijl bij patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson zijn gedefinieerd namelijk: 1) de preventie van cardiovasculaire complicaties; 2) het vertragen of tegenhouden van osteoporose (botontkalking); 3) het verbeteren van de cognitieve functie; 4) de preventie of behandeling van depressie; 5) het verbeteren van het slapen; 6) het verminderen van constipatie; 7) het verminderen van vermoeidheid; 8) het verbeteren van de functionele mobiliteit; 9) het verbeteren van de doelmatigheid van de parkinsonmedicatie; en 10) het optimaliseren van het dopaminerge systeem. Ondanks dat er veel onderzoek gedaan wordt naar de voordelen van een actieve leefstijl, bestaat er nog steeds een gebrek aan bewijs over de voordelen hiervan bij de ziekte van Parkinson. Het beste bewijs over de positieve effecten van fysieke activiteit bestaat voor hart- en vaatziekten, cognitief functioneren en stemming. Naast de positieve aspecten van fysieke activiteit is het ook van belang om in de gaten te houden of actievere patiënten niet meer gaan vallen, vaker valgerelateerde fracturen hebben of vaker cardiovasculaire complicaties ondervinden.

HOOFDSTUK 3
PREVALENTIE EN RISICOFACTOREN VAN OSTEOPOROSE

Een van de gezondheidsvoordelen van een actieve leefstijl is het positieve effect op de botmassa. Het verlies van botmassa komt vaker voor bij mensen met de ziekte van Parkinson dan in de algemene populatie. Er zijn verschillende factoren die betrokken zijn bij dit verlies aan botmassa. Daarnaast is osteoporose een belangrijke risicofactor voor het krijgen van fracturen. In Hoofdstuk 3 is de prevalentie van osteoporose en de mogelijke factoren die geassocieerd zijn met verlies van botmassa onderzocht bij 191 inactieve patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson.
De resultaten laten zien dat 53,2% van de patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson osteoporose hadden. Mensen die minder wegen en een laag vitamine D niveau hebben, hebben meer kans op een lagere botdichtheid. Daarnaast hebben vrouwen meer kans op een lagere botdichtheid. De vitamine D concentratie werd onderzocht tussen de 191 inactieve patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson en een controlegroep zonder de ziekte van Parkinson. De vitamine D concentratie bleek lager te zijn bij mensen met de ziekte van Parkinson in vergelijking met de groep zonder de ziekte van Parkinson.

Meer dan 50% van de inactieve patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson hebben een abnormale botdichtheid. Mensen die minder wegen en een laag vitamine D niveau hebben, hebben meer kans op een lagere botdichtheid. Daarnaast hebben vrouwen meer kans op een lagere botdichtheid. De vitamine D concentratie bleek lager te zijn bij mensen met de ziekte van Parkinson in vergelijking met een controlegroep zonder de ziekte van Parkinson.

**HOOFDSTUK 4**
**PATHOFYSIOLOGIE EN BEHANDELING VAN OSTEOPOROSE**
In Hoofdstuk 4 is de pathofysiologie en behandeling van osteoporose onderzocht doordrong van een literatuuronderzoek laten zien dat de vermindering van de botdichtheid veel verschillende factoren kent. Deze factoren zijn: 1) verminderde mobiliteit; 2) tekort aan vitamine D; 3) hyperhomocysteïnemie (een verhoogde waarde van het aminezuur homocysteïne in het bloed); 4) tekort aan vitamine B12 of foliumzuur; 5) ondervoeding of een laag lichaamsgewicht en 6) verminderde spierkracht. De behandeling met bisfosfonaten (geneesmiddel ter preventie van osteoporose), vitamine D en calcium verhogen de botdichtheid bij patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson. Het screenen van patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson op osteoporose zou vaker overwogen moeten worden en een therapeutische behandeling moet gestart worden bij die patiënten met bewezen osteoporose. Een adequate behandeling van osteoporose zou het risico op fracturen kunnen verminderen, maar de (kosten-)effectiviteit van deze aanpak moet onderzocht worden.

Een verlaagde botdichtheid bij de ziekte van Parkinson is multifactoriaal en bestaat uit een verminderde mobiliteit, vitamine D tekort, hyperhomocysteïnemie, vitamine B12 of foliumzuur tekort, ondervoeding of een laag lichaamsgewicht en een verminderde spierkracht.

**HOOFDSTUK 5**
**METEN VAN FYSIEKE ACTIVITEIT MET EEN ACTIVITEITENMONITOR**
Het meten van fysieke activiteit in het dagelijks leven is lastig. Er zijn verschillende methodes beschikbaar om het niveau van fysieke activiteit of energieverbruik te meten waaronder activiteitenmonitors. Het gebruik van activiteitenmonitors bij het langdurig meten van fysieke activiteit of het meten van de gelopen afstand is nog beperkt. In Hoofdstuk 5 is een simpele activiteitenmonitor die de gelopen afstand kan schatten onderzocht bij patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson. Deze monitor wordt gedragen in een riem op de rug en maakt gebruik van tri-axiale accelerometers. De resultaten laten zien dat deze monitor korte afstanden (tussen de 20 en 27 meter) precies kan schatten, maar dat het schatten van lange afstanden (maximaal 1097 meter) minder precies is. De afwijking van de werkelijk gelopen afstand ligt tussen de -42% en 41%. Hierdoor is het gebruik van deze monitor in de praktijk beperkt. Als de monitor gebruikt wordt als screeningsmethode, zal de werkelijk gelopen afstand de gemeten afstand min of plus 40% zijn.

De precisie van de activiteitenmonitor voor het schatten van lange afstanden is onvoldoende adequaat. Daarom is het gebruik van deze activiteitenmonitor voor klinische doeleinden beperkt.

**HOOFDSTUK 6**
**CARDIOVASCUULAIRE REACTIES BIJ PATIËNTEN MET DE ZIEKTE VAN PARKINSON**
Patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson zijn minder fysiek actief in vergelijking met gezonde controles. Autonome dysfunctie draagt mogelijk bij aan deze inactieve leefstijl. Mogelijk beperken veranderende cardiovasculaire reacties tijdens fysieke inspanning het ondernemen van fysieke activiteiten. In Hoofdstuk 6 zijn de cardiovasculaire reacties van patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson tijdens een submaximale inspanningstest op de fiets vergeleken met gezonde controles. Patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson bleken een lagere gezette maximale zuurstofopname te hebben vergeleken met gezonde controles (22 ml/min/kg versus 33 ml/min/kg). Daarnaast was meer dan de helft van de patiënten niet in staat hun hartslag adequaat (een hartslag boven de 120 slagen per minuut) te verhogen tijdens de submaximale inspanningstest, terwijl bijna alle gezonde controles hier wel toe in staat waren. Deze inadequade verhoging van de hartslag tijdens inspanning wordt mogelijk veroorzaakt door autonome dysfunctie.
HOOFDSTUK 7
RESULTATEN VAN DE PARKFIT STUDIE

In Hoofdstuk 7 wordt de ParkFit studie beschreven. De ParkFit studie richtte zich op de vraag of patiënten met de ziekte van Parkinson met een inactieve leefstijl in staat zijn middels een bewegingsbevorderingsprogramma hun niveau van fysieke activiteit te verhogen. Vervolgens werd onderzocht wat de mogelijke voordelen of nadelen van meer bewegen waren. Patiënten die deelnamen aan het onderzoek werden willekeurig verdeeld over twee fysiotherapeutische programma’s. Het ParkFit programma richtte zich op het bevorderen van een actieve leefstijl. De patiënten stelden samen met hun coach een beweegplan op met persoonlijke doelstellingen voor korte en lange termijn. Daarnaast ontvingen ze een activiteitenmonitor die hen visueel stimuleerde fysiek actiever te worden. Het controleprogramma richtte zich op het verbeteren van de kwaliteit van leven door verbeteren of behouden van zelfstandigheid, veiligheid en welbevinden tijdens bewegen.

In totaal werden er 586 patiënten twee jaar lang gevolgd en de verandering in het niveau van fysieke activiteit werd tussen de twee groepen vergeleken. De resultaten laten zien dat de tijd die besteed werd aan fysieke activiteit vergelijkbaar was tussen de twee groepen (verschil: 7%; 95% betrouwbaarheidsinterval -3 tot 17%; p=0.19). Analyses van de secundaire uitkomstmaten lieten echter wel een toename van fysieke activiteit bij patiënten die het ParkFit programma hadden gevolgd. Zowel op basis van een beweegdagboek (verschil van 30%; p<0.001), een activiteitenmonitor (verschil van 12%; p<0.001), als op de 6 minuten wandeltest (verschil van 4.8 meter; p=0.05) waren patiënten in het ParkFit programma significant verbeterd ten opzichte van de patiënten in het controleprogramma. Kwaliteit van leven gemeten met de PDQ-39 verschilde niet tussen beide groepen (verschil van 0.9 punten; p=0.14). Het aantal mensen dat één of meerdere keren viel, was vergelijkbaar tussen de twee groepen: ParkFit 62% en controles 67%.

HOOFDSTUK 8
EVALUATIE VAN HET PARKFIT PROGRAMMA

In Hoofdstuk 8 hebben we de verschillende elementen van het ParkFit programma geëvalueerd die relevant zijn voor toekomstige implementatie van het programma in de praktijk. Hiervoor zijn er vier verschillende elementen gemeten: 1) de ervaringen van patiënten en therapeuten met het programma middels vragenlijsten en interviews; 2) factoren die geassocieerd zijn met een verandering van het niveau van fysieke activiteit; en 3) analyses om effecten in verschillende subgroepen van patiënten te inventariseren; de indeling in subgroepen was gebaseerd op de volgende variabelen: niveau van fysieke activiteit op baseline; leeftijd; geslacht; ziekte ernst; ziekteduur; en mobiliteit van de patiënt.

Data van 255 patiënten (85%) en 116 (97%) fysiotherapeuten werden geanalyseerd. Zowel patiënten en therapeuten zijn positief over de interventie. Bijna alle therapeuten (90%) geven aan het ParkFit programma ook graag bij andere patiënten te willen gebruiken, 73% van de patiënten zouden het ParkFit programma aanbevelen aan andere patiënten. Aanbevelingen voor verdere implementatie zijn: 1) de behoefte aan (meer) scholing op het gebied van coaching en gedragsveranderingstechnieken; en 2) advies over het verhogen van het niveau van fysieke activiteit in specifieke groepen patiënten (bijvoorbeeld patiënten met comorbiditeiten).

Een lager niveau van fysieke activiteit op baseline en een hoger niveau van mobiliteit waren geassocieerd met een hogere toename van fysieke activiteit gedurende twee jaar (R²=48%). De subgroepanalyse laat zien dat het programma effectief is in bijna alle subgroepen. De meest inactive patiënten, vrouwen, patiënten met een lagere baselinescore op de UPDRS, patiënten met een korte leeftijd en oudere patiënten lijken het meeste voordeel te hebben van het programma.

Het ParkFit programma verhoogde het niveau van fysieke activiteit in bijna alle subgroepen van patiënten. Therapeuten en patiënten hadden geen grote belemmeringen ervaren voor verdere implementatie van het ParkFit programma.

Het ParkFit programma had geen invloed op het niveau van fysieke activiteit van mensen met de ziekte van Parkinson. Echter, de secundaire uitkomsten lieten een toename in het activiteiten niveau zien evenals een verbetering in fitheid, zónder dat mensen meer gingen vallen.
CHAPTER

DANKWOORD
DANKWOORD

‘Niet volmaakt is eerder perfect’. Als onderzoeker is dit soms moeilijk te geloven. De afgelopen jaren heb ik, weliswaar met vallen en opstaan, gestreefd naar het perfecte onderzoek. Jaren waarin ik ontzettend veel heb geleerd, hebben geleid tot dit eindresultaat, mijn proefschrift!

Er zijn veel mensen die hebben bijgedragen aan het realiseren van dit proefschrift op verschillende manieren. Het begin bij de kans die je krijgt om onderzoek te doen, patienten die zich inzetten om aan onderzoek mee te werken en de nodige hulp bij het schrijven van je artikelen. Mijn dank gaat dan ook uit naar iedereen die een bijdrage hebben geleverd aan de tot standkoming van dit proefschrift.

Een aantal personen verdienen een speciaal woord van dank:

ALLE PATIËNTEN EN FYSIOTHERAPEUTEN DIE HEBBEN DEELGENOMEN AAN HET ONDERZOEK, we hebben twee jaar lang veel van jullie gevraagd. Ik hoop dat we het onderzoek voor jullie in goede banen hebben kunnen leiden. Bedankt voor alle energie en tijd die jullie er in hebben gestoken.

MARlies,
het was een sprong in het diepe enige jaren geleden. Ik ben heel blij dat ik dit samen met jou heb mogen doen. Ik heb ontzettend veel met en van je geleerd. We hadden een enorme klus te klaren, en dat ging niet altijd vanzelf. Gelukkig ging onze samenwerking vaak wel als vanzelf, meestal hadden we aan één woord genoeg. Daarnaast waren deze jaren veel leuker samen met jou dan alleen! Al die jaren hebben we naast elkaar gestaan en het kan dan ook niet anders dat jij op deze dag ook naast me staat als mijn paranimf.

BAS EN MARTEN,
mijn promotor en copromotor. Begonnen als student en nu geëindigd als onderzoeker, zonder jullie had ik deze stap niet kunnen nemen. Ik heb veel van jullie geleerd afgelopen jaren, voornamelijk om ‘groot’ te denken. De manier waarop jullie altijd positief en zonder beperkingen tegen nieuwe dingen aanrijken zal me altijd blijven.

FRank,
DANKWOORD

BART,

mijn tweede copromotor. Je bent wat later op mijn pad gekomen, maar je betrokkenheid was er niet minder om. Ik heb ontzettend prettig met je samen gewerkt. Bedankt voor je interesse en je altijd snelle en heldere feedback.

GEORGE,

wat moet een promovendus zonder jou als statisticus. Bedankt voor je altijd kritische blik en discussies tijdens de gezamenlijke bijeenkomsten. Het is heel prettig hoe je van een hoop onduidelijke cijfers en analyses weer een heel helder geheel kunt maken. Dat heeft me elke keer weer nieuwe energie gegeven.

DE LEDEN VAN DE MANUSCRIPTCOMMISSIE,

–Ria Nijhuis-van der Sanden, Bob van Hilten en Marijke Hopman-Rock– dank ik hartelijk voor de inhoudelijke beoordeling van mijn manuscript.

ALLE LEDEN VAN DE PROJECTGROEP EN DE ADVIESRAAD VAN DE PARKFIT STUDIE,

wil ik heel erg bedanken voor alle goede adviezen tijdens de opzet en uitvoering van de studie. Alle coauteurs van de verschillende artikelen wil ik bedanken voor het lezen, aanvullen en kritische commentaar op de artikelen. Bedankt voor de fijne samenwerking.

DE ONDERZOEKSASSISTENTEN,

Karin, Mirte, Anita, Thijs, Ine en Marloes. Heel erg dank voor al jullie inzet! Tia, Marije en Willeke, zonder jullie geen onderzoek. Jullie hebben het niet altijd makkelijk gehad met ons, als we weer eens met een nieuw in te vullen schema aankwamen, 600 brieven de deur uitmoesten, 150 therapeuten gebeld moesten worden of als jullie in alle vroegte met de witte citroen saxo op pad moesten! Bedankt voor de bergen werk die jullie voor ons verzet hebben. Het was ontzettend fijn om jullie als onderzoekssistenten te hebben.

ALLE STAGIAIRES EN ALLE STUDENTEN,

van de opleiding Fysiotherapie en Sport, Gezondheid en Management van de HAN die stage hebben gelopen bij de ParkFit studie de afgelopen jaren. Heel erg dank voor jullie inzet, tijd en energie die jullie hebben gestoken in het meten van alle patiënten, het invoeren van data en de vele telefoontjes die jullie hebben gepleegd.

ALLE COLLEGA’S VAN DE AFDeling NEUROLOGIE EN ONDERZOEKERS VAN PARC,

wat heeft een promovendus naast goede begeleiding nog meer nodig? Fijne collega’s die altijd in zijn voor een discussie over vele uiteenlopende zaken! Gelukkig hebben we naast onze drukke werkzaamheden toch momenten weten te vinden om ons werk ook eens van de andere kant te bekijken.

KATRIN,

wat was het fijn om jou als collega en kamergenoot te hebben. Ik heb veel geleerd van je altijd heerlijke kritische blik op onderzoek en ontzettend met en om je gelachen. Never a dull moment with you! Gelukkig is het nu eindelijk tijd voor je sketch, ik kan niet wachten.

MIJN LIEVE FAMILIE EN VRIENDINNEN,


LIEVE MARINA,

allereerst bedankt voor jullie vriendschap, voor dat je er altijd voor me bent en voor wie je bent. Ik kan altijd rekenen op je steun (ik weet niet hoeveel belminuten er door heen gegaan zijn), hard met je lachen, of bijkletsen met een kopje thee op de bank. Bedankt voor al die keuken dingen die we samen hebben mogen meemaken en nog gaan meemaken. Ik ben dan ook heel blij dat jij op deze dag mij mijn paranimf wilt zijn.

LIEVE CLAUDIA EN STEFAN,

wat fijn dat ik zo’n lieve zus en broertje heb. Bedankt voor jouw steun, goede zorgen en interesse in mijn onderzoek. Ondanks dat jullie allemaal naar het hoge Noorden vertrokken zijn zien we elkaar gelukkig nog regelmatig, al is het soms via de webcam. Als ik Jilia weer lief in de camera heb zien lachen is mijn dag altijd weer goed, maar liever natuurlijk de ‘live’ knuffels! Nynke Hester en Riemer, ik ben blij met jullie als ‘schoon-’ broer en zus.

LIEVE PAPA EN MAMA,

meer dan ooit besef ik me hoeveel jullie voor mij doen. Jullie hebben me altijd gestimuleerd het beste uit mezelf te halen en voor het hoogst haalbare te gaan. Bedankt voor alle goede zorgen, gevraagd en ongevraagd, steun en alle mogelijkheden die jullie me hebben gegeven.
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