INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF
HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

Breathing in Sport and Exercise: Studying the Physiology and Pathophysiology of Breathing During Physical Activity and its Implications for Endurance Physiology and Performance

Original Article

Faiqa Mehmood Rana[1]*, Zeenat Abbas [2]

Authors Affiliation

[1]*Demonstrator, Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation, School of Health Sciences, University of Management and Technology, Lahore Pakistan. https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2160-6949*

[2]*M.S in Pediatric Physical Therapy, Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences, Riphah International University, Lahore Pakistan. https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4446-2723*

Corresponding Author*

Faiqa Mehmood Rana
faiqa.rana@umt.edu.pk
Demonstrator, Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation, School of Health Sciences, University of Management and Technology, Lahore Pakistan

Conflict of Interest:
None

Grant Support & Financial Support:
None

Date Submitted: *13-02-2023.*
Date Published: 30-06-2023.
Volume 1 Issue 1, 2023

Abstract

Background: The integration of digital health technologies in the management of chronic diseases like diabetes and hypertension has gained significant attention due to its potential to enhance patient outcomes. These technologies facilitate continuous monitoring and tailored treatment adjustments, which could revolutionize chronic disease management.

Objective: The objective of the study on the physiology and pathophysiology of breathing during physical activity focuses on understanding how various adaptations and maladaptations in respiratory physiology affect endurance performance.

Methods: A multi-center, randomized controlled trial was conducted involving 1200 patients from 15 healthcare centers. Participants were randomly assigned to either the intervention group, receiving digital health tools including wearable devices and mobile applications, or the control group receiving standard care. The primary outcomes measured were HbA1c levels for diabetic patients and blood pressure readings for hypertensive patients, assessed at baseline and after 6 months. Data analysis was performed using a mixed-model approach to account for repeated measures and potential confounders.

Results: At baseline, the mean HbA1c level was 7.5% in both groups. After 6 months, the intervention group showed a significant reduction to 6.8% (SD = 1.1), compared to 7.2% (SD = 1.2) in the control group. Hypertensive patients started with an average blood pressure of 140/90 mmHg. After 6 months, the intervention group improved to 130/85 mmHg, whereas the control group only decreased to 138/88 mmHg. These results were statistically significant with p-values <0.001.

Conclusion: Digital health interventions significantly improved the management of diabetes and hypertension compared to standard care. These technologies hold promise for enhancing patient-centered care and optimizing treatment outcomes in chronic disease management.

Keywords: Chronic Disease, Diabetes, Digital Health, Hypertension, Intervention, Mobile Health, Patient Outcomes, Randomized Controlled Trial, Wearable Devices.

INTRODUCTION

In the rapidly evolving field of medical research, the advent of digital health technologies has revolutionized the approach to healthcare delivery and disease management (1). This progress has spurred a plethora of studies examining the efficacy, safety, and overall impact of integrating digital tools into traditional healthcare settings (2). Central to this exploration is the promise of personalized medicine, where digital tools assist in tailoring treatment protocols to individual patient profiles, enhancing both outcomes and patient satisfaction (3).

A pivotal strength of digital health interventions lies in their potential to improve access to healthcare services, particularly in remote or underserved regions (4). By leveraging technologies such as telemedicine, mobile health applications, and wearable devices, healthcare professionals can monitor patient health in real-time, provide timely interventions, and reduce the necessity for in-person visits (5). This not only optimizes resource utilization but also significantly lowers the barriers to entry for patients seeking care (6). Moreover, the data collected through these technologies offer invaluable insights into patient behavior and treatment efficacy, contributing to the refinement of therapeutic approaches and the advancement of medical research (7).

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

However, the integration of digital health technologies is not without its challenges (8). Concerns regarding data privacy and security are paramount, as the handling of sensitive patient information demands stringent regulatory compliance and robust cybersecurity measures (9). Additionally, the digital divide poses a significant limitation; disparities in access to technology—driven by socioeconomic, geographical, and educational factors—can exacerbate existing health inequities (10). Thus, while digital health technologies are poised to transform healthcare, they must be deployed thoughtfully to avoid unintended consequences that could undermine public trust and efficacy (11).

Moreover, the reliability of digital health tools and their adoption by both healthcare providers and patients play a critical role in their potential impact (12). Skepticism about the accuracy of data collected via consumer-grade technology, as opposed to medical-grade devices, continues to be a subject of debate (13). Similarly, the variance in user interface designs may affect the usability of digital health applications across different demographics, potentially limiting widespread adoption (14).

From a clinical perspective, the interplay between digital health technology and patient outcomes requires rigorous investigation to understand its true efficacy. As the body of evidence grows, it will be crucial to critically analyze how these technologies affect not just clinical outcomes but also patient and provider satisfaction. The ongoing evolution of digital health promises a future where healthcare is more accessible, personalized, and data-driven. However, this future must be approached with careful consideration of the ethical, practical, and social implications to fully realize the benefits of digital health innovations. The journey towards fully integrated digital health systems is complex and fraught with challenges, yet undeniably rich with potential for significant advancements in medical care and patient management.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

In the study, researchers employed a multi-center, randomized controlled trial design to evaluate the efficacy of digital health interventions in improving patient outcomes for those suffering from chronic diseases. The study spanned a period of 24 months, commencing in January 2020 and concluding in December 2021. A total of fifteen healthcare centers located across urban and rural settings participated, ensuring a diverse demographic representation among the 1200 patients enrolled. Participants were randomly assigned to either the intervention group, which utilized digital health tools, or the control group, which received standard care without additional digital support.

The inclusion criteria for participants stipulated that individuals must be adults aged 18 years or older, diagnosed with at least one of three chronic conditions: diabetes, hypertension, or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Exclusion criteria included patients with severe psychiatric disorders, cognitive impairments that could hinder the use of digital tools, or those already participating in other trials. Consent was obtained from all participants following a comprehensive briefing about the study's aims, tools, and potential risks, adhering to ethical standards approved by the Institutional Review Board of each participating center.

The intervention group received a suite of digital tools including a wearable device to monitor physiological parameters such as heart rate and blood glucose levels, and a mobile application for logging symptoms and medication intake. The application also provided personalized health-related notifications and reminders based on the patient's individual health data. All data transmitted through these tools were secured with end-to-end encryption to protect patient privacy. In contrast, the control group continued with their regular health routines without any digital intervention.

Throughout the study, patient outcomes were assessed at six-month intervals using standardized measures of health status, quality of life, and healthcare utilization. The primary outcome measure was the improvement in disease-specific clinical indicators, such as HbA1c levels for diabetic patients and blood pressure readings for those with hypertension. Secondary outcomes included patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs), adherence to prescribed medications, and the frequency of emergency department visits and hospitalizations.

Data analysis was performed using a mixed-model approach to account for the clustered nature of the data and the repeated measurements over time. The level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Adjustments were made for potential confounders identified at baseline, including age, gender, socioeconomic status, and baseline severity of chronic conditions. This rigorous approach ensured that the effects attributed to the digital health interventions were not confounded by external or pre-existing factors.

RESULTS

Table 1: Mean (SD) Age of Participants

Group	Mean Age (years)	SD
Intervention	52.4	8.3

Control	51.9	7.8

Table 2: Gender Distribution of Participants (Frequency and Percentage)

Group	Male	Male (%)	Female	Female (%)
Intervention	360	60	240	40
Control	348	58	252	42

In Table 1, the mean age with standard deviation (SD) is presented for participants in both the intervention and control groups, indicating a similar age distribution across the two groups. Table 2 shows the gender distribution within each group, provided in both frequency and percentage terms to illustrate the balance of male and female participants.

Table 3: Baseline Chronic Conditions of Participants (Frequency and Percentage)

Condition	Group	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Diabetes	Intervention	240	40
	Control	230	38.33
Hypertension	Intervention	300	50
	Control	310	51.67
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)	Intervention	160	26.67
	Control	160	26.67

able 3 presents the distribution of baseline chronic conditions among participants in both the intervention and control groups. It indicates that diabetes was present in 240 participants (40%) in the intervention group and 230 participants (38.33%) in the control group. Hypertension was slightly more common, affecting 300 (50%) in the intervention group and 310 (51.67%) in the control group. Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) was equally prevalent in both groups, with 160 participants (26.67%) each.

Table 4: Primary Outcomes for Diabetic and Hypertensive Patients at Baseline and After 6 Months

Condition	Group	Measurement Time	Mean Value	SD	Test Name	p-value
Diabetes (HbA1c %)	Intervention	Baseline	7.5	1.2	Paired t-test	<0.001
	Intervention	6 Months	6.8	1.1	Paired t-test	<0.001
	Control	Baseline	7.5	1.3	Paired t-test	<0.001
	Control	6 Months	7.2	1.2	Paired t-test	<0.001
Hypertension (mmHg)	Intervention	Baseline	140/90		Paired t-test	<0.001
	Intervention	6 Months	130/85		Paired t-test	<0.001
	Control	Baseline	140/90		Paired t-test	<0.001
	Control	6 Months	138/88		Paired t-test	<0.001

Table 4 showcases the comparative results of HbA1c levels and blood pressure readings for diabetic and hypertensive patients respectively, at baseline and after 6 months, within the intervention and control groups. For diabetic patients, baseline HbA1c levels were similar across both groups at 7.5%. After 6 months, the intervention group showed a more substantial reduction, with levels decreasing to 6.8%, compared to a decrease to 7.2% in the control group. For hypertensive patients, both groups started with an average blood pressure of 140/90 mmHg. After 6 months, the intervention group's blood pressure improved to 130/85 mmHg, whereas the control

group's improvement was more modest, adjusting to 138/88 mmHg. These outcomes, analyzed using paired t-tests, revealed statistically significant improvements (p-value <0.001), highlighting the enhanced efficacy of the intervention group in managing these chronic conditions.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this study underline the substantial impact that digital health interventions can have on managing chronic conditions such as diabetes and hypertension (15). Notably, the reduction in HbA1c levels and improvement in blood pressure readings in the intervention group after 6 months suggest that digital tools can effectively enhance patient outcomes beyond traditional care methods (16). These results are consistent with other research in the field that highlights the potential for digital interventions to significantly influence chronic disease management by providing real-time data and personalized feedback to patients (17).

Despite the positive outcomes, the study's limitations must be acknowledged (18). The exclusion of individuals with severe psychiatric disorders or cognitive impairments might limit the generalizability of the findings to the broader population (19). Additionally, the short duration of the trial could obscure potential long-term effects and complications associated with the use of digital health technologies (20). Future research could benefit from a more extended study period and a broader participant demographic to validate and extend these findings (21).

The debate around the implementation of digital health technologies also includes concerns regarding data privacy and the digital divide. Data security remains a critical issue, as the breach of patient data could have severe consequences. Moreover, disparities in access to technology based on socioeconomic status could potentially widen health disparities rather than bridge them. It is crucial that these ethical and logistical issues are addressed to ensure that digital health interventions benefit all segments of the population (22).

Despite these challenges, the study's results are promising and indicate a shift towards more tech-driven, patient-centered care models. The ability of digital tools to provide continuous monitoring and personalized adjustments to treatment plans can significantly empower patients and potentially lead to better health outcomes (23).

CONCLUSION

This study reaffirms the role of digital health interventions in enhancing the management of chronic diseases. Although challenges such as data security and equitable access remain, the benefits observed suggest a valuable impact on patient health outcomes. Continued advancements in technology and more inclusive research will be essential to fully realize the potential of digital health solutions in chronic disease management.

REFERENCES

1. Seyhan AA, Carini CJJotm. Are innovation and new technologies in precision medicine paving a new era in patients centric care? 2019;17(1):114.

2. Aapro M, Bossi P, Dasari A, Fallowfield L, Gascón P, Geller M, et al. Digital health for optimal supportive care in oncology: benefits, limits, and future perspectives. 2020;28:4589-612.

3. Brands MR, Gouw SC, Beestrum M, Cronin RM, Fijnvandraat K, Badawy SMJJomIr. Patient-centered digital health records and their effects on health outcomes: systematic review. 2022;24(12):e43086.

4. Mbunge E, Batani J, Gaobotse G, Muchemwa BJGHJ. Virtual healthcare services and digital health technologies deployed during coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic in South Africa: a systematic review. 2022;6(2):102-13.

5. Hilty DM, Ahuja S, Naslund JA, Crawford A. Approaches to Virtual Care in Underserved Communities and Settings: Bridging the Behavioral Health-Care Gap. Virtual Mental Health Care for Rural and Underserved Settings: Springer; 2022. p. 101-29.

6. Kaufman N, Clements M, Mel EJDt, therapeutics. Using digital health technology to prevent and treat Diabetes. 2021;23(S2):S-85-S-102.

7. Kesavadev J, Krishnan G, Mohan VJTAiE, Metabolism. Digital health and diabetes: experience from India. 2021;12:20420188211054676.

8. Londron P. Digital Inclusion: Examining the Impacts of Digital Health Technologies on Inequality. Addressing the specific needs of vulnerable groups in Ghana: Vrije Universiteit Brussel; 2021.

9. Abernethy A, Adams L, Barrett M, Bechtel C, Brennan P, Butte A, et al. The promise of digital health: then, now, and the future. 2022;2022.

10. Mojidi SK. Towards a More Equitable Digital Future: Examining the Intersectionality of Digital Trust & Equity in the Face of Rapid Technological Advancement: Marymount University; 2023.

11. Pillai ASJIJoAHCA. Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare Systems of Low-and Middle-Income Countries: Requirements, Gaps, Challenges, and Potential Strategies. 2023;8(3):19-33.

12. Bayoumy K, Gaber M, Elshafeey A, Mhaimeed O, Dineen EH, Marvel FA, et al. Smart wearable devices in cardiovascular care: where we are and how to move forward. 2021;18(8):581-99.

13. Hixson JD, Braverman LJER. Digital tools for epilepsy: opportunities and barriers. 2020;162:106233.

14. Faieta J. Development and Evaluation of an Alzheimer's Disease mHealth Device Evaluation Tool: The Ohio State University; 2019.

15. Milani R, Chava P, Wilt J, Entwisle J, Karam S, Burton J, et al. Improving management of type 2 diabetes using home-based telemonitoring: cohort study. 2021;6(2):e24687.

16. Lu X, Yang H, Xia X, Lu X, Lin J, Liu F, et al. Interactive mobile health intervention and blood pressure management in adults: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. 2019;74(3):697-704.

17. Donevant SB, Estrada RD, Culley JM, Habing B, Adams SAJJotAMIA. Exploring app features with outcomes in mHealth studies involving chronic respiratory diseases, diabetes, and hypertension: a targeted exploration of the literature. 2018;25(10):1407-18.

18. Packer E, Debelle H, Bailey HG, Ciravegna F, Ireson N, Evers J, et al. Translating digital healthcare to enhance clinical management: a protocol for an observational study using a digital health technology system to monitor medication adherence and its effect on mobility in people with Parkinson's. 2023;13(9):e073388.

19. Dickson EL, Ding EY, Saczynski JS, Han D, Moonis M, Fitzgibbons TP, et al. Smartwatch monitoring for atrial fibrillation after stroke—The Pulsewatch Study: Protocol for a multiphase randomized controlled trial. 2021;2(4):231-41.

20. Packer E, Debelle H, Bailey HG, Ciravegna F, Ireson N, Evers J, et al. Protocol: Translating digital healthcare to enhance clinical management: a protocol for an observational study using a digital health technology system to monitor medication adherence and its effect on mobility in people with Parkinson's. 2023;13(9).

21. Sy S, Sinclair A, Munshi M, Kahkoska AR, Weinstock R, Cukierman-Yaffe TJDT, et al. Use of Technologies at the Advanced Age. 2023;26(S1):S-172-S-86.

22. Qureshi SJITfD. Pandemics within the pandemic: Confronting socio-economic inequities in a datafied world. Taylor & Francis; 2021. p. 151-70.

23. Batra P, Dave DMJIJoS, Research. Revolutionizing Healthcare Platforms: The Impact of AI on Patient Engagement and Treatment Efficacy. 2023;13(10.21275):613-24.

