Functional Impact of HIV Associated Neurocognitive Disorder (HAND) and Strategies for Rehabilitation in the UK

Elizabeth Stevens HIV Occupational Therapist
Heartlands Hospital Birmingham UK

Toronto June 2013
Patient perception

“I don’t read any more”

“What’s wrong with me?”

“I feel dyslexic”

“I frequently forget to take my pills”

“My partner does all the cooking now”
Strategies for Rehabilitation

Depression or anxiety can masquerade as HAND.

Intervention around mood can reduce stress symptoms and then frequently the person reports their memory has improved – they did not have HAND.

Conversely HAND might cause low mood/anxiety in itself.
Stress Management

Stress management focusing on teaching relaxation and other self-help skills is used

Occupational re-engagement is a medium for improving both mood problems & HAND symptoms
Memory Strategies

Specific memory strategies for individual people – depends on their context

Many are very simple
Alarm as reminder

Routine /habituation

Use of key-ring pill holder

Visual prompts – pills kept where they can be seen
AHC started in January 2011

July 2012
- Presented data on 131 patients
- Fortnightly clinic
- HADS
- IHDS cut off 10

June 2013
- Presenting data on 211 patients (up to April 2013)
- Clinic expanded to weekly
- HADS
- IHDS cut off 9
Demographics
(whole cohort N=211)

- Female n52 (25%)
- Male n159 (75%)
- Exactly the same ratio as before (and when split between the first 131 and the second 80)
- Average age of this cohort: 43 years
- Range 22 – 73 years
- ≥ 50 years = 45 people (21%)
Total cohort at 2013 – 211 patients

- Total qualifying for follow up for any reason = 112 (53%)
- Total not for follow up at all = 99 (47%)

- Overall average length of diagnosis = 7.6 years
IHDS totals distribution across cohort of 211
IHDS total scores (whole cohort)

- Average total score = 10.2
- 95 (45%) scored 10 or below – 36 (38%) of the 95 were BA
- 49 (23%) scored 9 or below - 18 (37%) of the 49 were BA
- 38 of these scored maximum 12/12. Six (16%) of these were BA.
- 37 people scored on the cut off of 10. 15 (41%) of these were BA.
- 23 scored 9 of which 8 (35%) were BA.
Average scores on IHDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black African cohort</th>
<th>Caucasian cohort</th>
<th>Other ethnic origins</th>
<th>≥ 50 years</th>
<th>49 and under</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in whole group of 211 people</td>
<td>65 (31%)</td>
<td>126 (60%)</td>
<td>20 (9%)</td>
<td>45 (21%)</td>
<td>166 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average IHDS score /12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number identified for neurocog F/U*</td>
<td>32 (49%)</td>
<td>44 (35%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>23 (51%)</td>
<td>63 (38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NB those identified here were a mix of using cut-off of 10 and of 9
Ethnic background of those identified for F/U using 10 and 9 as the cut off for further assessment

10 and below
- Caucasian: 49 (52%)
- Black African: 36 (38%)
- From other ethnic backgrounds: 10 (10%)

9 and below
- Caucasian: 25 (51%)
- Black African: 18 (37%)
- From other ethnic backgrounds: 6 (12%)
Comparison of follow ups in ≥50 years at cut off 9 or 10 on IHDS

- In the first 131 people, 67% of those aged 50 and over were identified for follow up (total 27 people ≥50 and 18 were followed up)

- Now 47% were identified for follow up (total 45 people ≥50 and 23 were followed up)

- This includes the first cohort analysed and changing the cut off score has dropped the numbers identified. This will presumably decrease further over time
Were the IHDS scores lower in the ≥50 years cohort?

Average IHDS total for all ≥50 years: 9.4

Average IHDS score for the 23 people identified for neurocognitive follow up: 8

Average IHDS total for all under 50 years: 10.4

Average IHDS score for the 63 people identified for neurocognitive follow up: 9.2
Average length of diagnosis

- Over 50 years: 9.4 years
- Under 50 years: 7.1 years
Conclusions

• The AHC clinic helps identify people who might not have been seen otherwise
• Lowering the IHDS cut-off score from 10 to 9 has enabled us to focus time on those most in need
• Lowering the IHDS score has not changed the proportion of BA patients who are seen as needing further input
• Those aged over 50 have lower IHDS scores – work needs to be done to see if this correlates directly with real life impairment
Conclusions

 The most important aspect is that regardless of screening or assessment, functional intervention is needed in order to make it meaningful

 Will continue to collect practice data and analyse again when numbers are larger see how significant the differences are

 Intended to compare the further assessment outcomes of those at IHDS 10 and those at IHDS 9 and below

 Need to compare against nadir CD4
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