



Curtin University

enAble Institute

What are the benefits of reablement for older people?

Adjunct Professor Gill Lewin

Co-authors: John Parsons, Hilary O'Connell, Silke Metzelthin



Introduction

- Do individuals benefit? - important question
- Reablement aims to optimise function and enable independence
- People want to live and be independent in own way
- Reablement is/should be individually tailored
- Reablement service models differ
- Variety of outcome types and measures used to assess benefit



Method

- Evidence reviewed:
 - Interventions aimed at helping person regain or retain the ability to manage some aspects of their care and client outcomes examined
 - Research or evaluations conducted in last 20 years including 6 systematic reviews:- Cochrane et al 2016, Legg et al 2016, Pettersen & Iwarsson 2017, Sims-Gould et al 2017, Tessier et al 2016, Whitehead et al 2016; plus relevant papers outside periods looked at in these reviews



Findings

- Most common outcomes – daily activities, physical function, quality of life (QoL). Range of other outcomes
- While ability to perform daily activities was often one of primary outcomes examined, others often only secondary
- Variety of measures used for each outcome type with different methodologies and for physical function different abilities and QoL different conceptual bases
- Results mixed/inconsistent
- Studies often flawed



Do individuals benefit from Reablement?

- Overall, results weak and no more than “promising”
- Some evidence for improvement in QoL, mobility and daily functioning
- Evaluation results generally more positive than research
- Some individuals benefit more than others
- No evidence that benefits are less than usual home care



Issues limiting evidence

- Reablement not one size fits all
- Not all outcomes relevant to everyone but do need agreed set of measures for different types of outcomes
- Service models differ as do individuals' goals
- Need taxonomy of elements and personal record
- Few rigorous RCTs, but appropriateness of design questionable



Our conclusions

- Evidence of individual benefit still only “promising”
- BUT if more cost effective than traditional approach
- GIVEN users satisfied and no evidence of harm
- SHOULD be universal system wide adoption
- WITH universally adopted outcome measures and lots more research with features of services clearly described



Key References

Systematic Reviews (published before chapter written)

1. Cochrane, A. et al. (2016) 'Time-limited home-care reablement services for maintaining and improving the functional independence of older adults', *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 10. Art. No.: CD010825.
2. Legg, L. et al. (2016) 'A systematic review of the evidence on home care reablement services', *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 30(8): 741-749.
3. Petterssen, C. & Iwarsson, S. (2017) 'Evidence-based interventions involving occupational therapists are needed in re-ablement for older community-living people: A systematic review', *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 80(5): 273–285.
4. Sims-Gould, J. (2017) 'Reablement, Reactivation, Rehabilitation and Restorative Interventions with Older Adults in Receipt of Home Care: A Systematic Review', *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 18: 653-663.
5. Tessier, A. et al. (2016) 'Effectiveness of Reablement: A systematic Review', *Healthcare Policy*, 11(4): 49-59.
6. Whitehead, P.J. et al. (2015) 'Interventions to reduce dependency in personal activities of daily living in community dwelling adults who use homecare services: a systematic review', *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 29(11): 1064-1076.



References

Systematic Reviews (published after chapter written)

1. Bennett, C. et al. (2022) 'An investigation of Reablement or restorative homecare interventions and outcome effects: A systematic review of randomised control trials', *Health & Social Care in the Community* DOI:10.1111/hsc14108.
2. Buma, L.E. et al. (2022) 'Effects on clients' daily functioning and common features of reablement interventions: a systematic literature review', *European Journal of Ageing*, 1-27.
3. Mulquiny, L. & Oakman, J. (2022) 'Exploring the experience of reablement: A systematic review and qualitative evidence synthesis of older people's and carers' views', *Health & Social Care in the Community*,30(5):1471-1483.

Studies subsequent to systematic reviews included in chapter

1. Beresford, B. et al. (2019b) 'Reablement services for people at risk of needing social care: the MoRe mixed-methods evaluation', *Health Services Delivery Research*, 7(16).
2. Parsons, M. et al. (2018) 'Supported Discharge Teams for older people in hospital acute care hospital: a randomised controlled trial', *Age and Ageing*, 47: 288-94.
3. Parsons, M. et al. (2019) 'Post-acute care for older people following injury: a randomized controlled trial', *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 21:404-09.
4. Langeland, E. et al. (2019) 'A multicenter investigation of reablement in Norway: a clinical controlled trial', *BMC Geriatrics*, 19(1):29-29.