



Published in final edited form as:

*Mov Disord.* 2016 September ; 31(9): 1258–1262. doi:10.1002/mds.26744.

## Moving Parkinson care to the home

E. Ray Dorsey, MD, MBA<sup>1,2</sup>, Floris P. Vlaanderen, MD<sup>4</sup>, Lucien Engelen<sup>3</sup>, Karl Kieburtz, MD, MPH<sup>1,2</sup>, William Zhu, BA<sup>2</sup>, Kevin M. Biglan, MD, MPH<sup>1,2</sup>, Marjan J. Faber, PhD<sup>4</sup>, and Bastiaan R. Bloem, MD, PhD<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Neurology, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY <sup>2</sup>CHET, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY <sup>3</sup>Radboud university medical center; REshape Center; Nijmegen, The Netherlands <sup>4</sup>Radboud university medical center, Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, Scientific Center for Quality of Healthcare, Nijmegen, The Netherlands <sup>5</sup>Radboud university medical center, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behavior, Department of Neurology, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

### Keywords

Parkinson disease; health care delivery; home; telehealth; e-health; self-management

Current care models do not meet the needs of individuals with Parkinson disease (PD).<sup>1–3</sup> Many have limited access to proper care and that care, when delivered, is institution-based rather than patient-centered (Table). In this viewpoint, we examine the shortcomings in current care, the need for home-based care, the emerging models, and the barriers to overcome. While written from the perspective of the United States and Europe, the piece will hopefully have broader applications.

**Corresponding author:** Ray Dorsey, University of Rochester Medical Center, 265 Crittenden Boulevard, CU 420694, Rochester, NY 14642, 585.276.6824 (tel), 585.461.4594 (fax), ray.dorsey@chet.rochester.edu.

### Financial disclosure/conflict of interest

Dr. Dorsey is a consultant to MC10, a wearable sensor company.

### Authors' Roles:

(1) Research Project: A. Conception, B. Organization, C. Execution; (2) Statistical Analysis: A. Design, B. Execution, C. Review and Critique; (3) Manuscript: A. Writing of the First Draft, B. Review and Critique. 1A, 3A, 3B

1. E.R.D.: 1A, 1B, 1C, 3A, 3B
2. F.P.V.: 1B, 1C, 3B
3. L.E.: 3B
4. K.K.: 1B, 1C, 3B
5. W.Z.: 1B, 1C, 3B
6. K.M.B.: 1B, 1C, 3B
7. M.J.F.: 1B, 1C, 3B
8. B.R.B.: 1A, 1B, 1C, 3A, 3B

F.V., L.E., W.Z., and M.J.F have nothing to declare.

## The shortcomings of current care

In 2001, the Institute of Medicine (now the Health and Medicine Division of the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine), a U.S. non-profit that provides independent, objective analysis, issued its landmark report *Crossing the Quality Chasm*. The report opens, “The American health care delivery system is in need of fundamental change.” It further states, “Quality problems are everywhere, affecting many patients. Between the health care we have and the care we could have lies not just a gap, but a chasm.”<sup>4</sup> The report lists six aims to cross this chasm, proposing that health care should be safe, effective, patient-centered, timely, efficient, and equitable.

However, current care for PD, in the U.S., Europe, and likely the majority of the world, frequently does not meet these six aims. First, Parkinson disease care is often not safe. Individuals with PD who are hospitalized are often subjected to delayed treatment, contra-indicated medications, prolonged immobility, lengthy stays, and high mortality.<sup>5,6</sup> Second, while some comprehensive and distributed PD care models<sup>3,7</sup> are quite effective, few patients receive such care, and many PD-related hospitalizations are likely preventable.<sup>8</sup> Third and fourth, providing patient-centered care that is timely has been studied little.<sup>9</sup> Despite the limited evidence, focus groups and surveys suggest that individuals with PD want more personalized information from multiple disciplines that is delivered remotely in a timely manner.<sup>9,10</sup> Fifth, PD care is very inefficient. Patients and their caregivers spend hours travelling and waiting in the clinic for routine follow-up appointments.<sup>11</sup> Outside the clinic, nearly 25% of Americans over 65 with PD reside in expensive nursing homes that cost more than \$200 per day<sup>12</sup> – money that could be devoted to preventing the need for institutional care for many.

Finally, perhaps most concerning is the inequity of current PD care. A primary determinant of care received remains where you live. In the U.S., 42% of individuals with PD over 65 and up to 100% of individuals in some rural areas do not see a neurologist soon after diagnosis.<sup>2</sup> In Europe, the first right expressed in the European Parkinson’s Disease Association Charter is care from a physician with a special interest in PD,<sup>13</sup> yet 44% of Europeans do not see a PD specialist in the first two years after diagnosis.<sup>1</sup> Beyond neurological care, access to specialist nurses, occupational therapists, and counselors is often more limited.<sup>14</sup> In less wealthy countries, the situation is even worse. China only has approximately 50 movement disorder specialists to care for over two million individuals with PD.<sup>15</sup> In Bolivia, a door to door epidemiology study found that none of the individuals identified with PD had ever seen a physician, much less received treatment.<sup>16</sup>

New, comprehensive PD care models are emerging that seek to deliver care that is aligned with the aims articulated by the Institute of Medicine.<sup>3,17</sup> For example, ParkinsonNet, a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary care model in the Netherlands, can enhance care, improve health, and lower costs.<sup>3,17</sup> Still, these models are resource intensive and demanding of patients and their caregivers. For example, integrated multi-disciplinary care models require individuals with limited mobility and driving ability to visit physical therapists and speech therapists three times per week for several weeks. Surgical treatments, such as deep brain

stimulation, make similar requirements – often lifelong ones – for follow-up care for individuals with more advanced disease.

## Need for home-based care

To improve PD care, more of it must be delivered at home. Home care is not new. In the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the house call was a dominant means of providing care, with 40% of physician-patient encounters in 1930 occurring in the home.<sup>18</sup> However, advances in transportation and diagnostics that had to be delivered in medical centers (e.g., x-ray, EKG) contributed to the house call's decline. Early in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, house calls are returning. They are available through home-based chronic care models,<sup>19</sup> on-demand house calls by physicians for episodic care,<sup>20</sup> and a “hospital at home” model.<sup>21</sup> The latter model provides hospital-level care, including physician and nurse visits and intravenous medications, for acute conditions like pneumonia directly in the home. These models can generate equal or better clinical outcomes, improve patient satisfaction, and lower costs,<sup>21</sup> yet few have been applied to PD. In addition to in-person care at home, the next generation house call, enabled by advances in telecommunications, is also emerging.<sup>11,22</sup> Through video visits, these virtual house calls enable frequent consultations and provide specialty care to patients independent of geography.

The demand for in-home care is likely to grow due to demographic, social, and technological factors. Both the absolute number and proportion of older individuals with PD will increase. Due to aging populations, the prevalence of PD in the world's most populous nations will rise to over 8.7 million patients, twice as much as it was in 2005.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, rising life expectancies (four years in the U.S. and six years globally in the last two decades)<sup>24</sup> along with new therapies for advanced PD<sup>25</sup> may increase the survival of individuals with the condition, leading to more individuals with advanced disease.

Social shifts are also driving home care. The splintering of the extended family, the increased mobility of the nuclear family, and the strong desire of older individuals to remain in their own homes<sup>26</sup> lead to geographically separated children caring for aging parents. These children will increasingly demand technology solutions that enable them to care for their parents, monitor their health, and connect to their parents' clinicians conveniently. In addition, more older individuals are discovering the internet, tablets, and smartphones for themselves.<sup>27</sup>

Lastly, technological advances are enabling individuals with PD and other chronic conditions<sup>28</sup> to access specialists in satellite clinics or in their homes.<sup>22</sup> Preliminary evidence suggests that web-based video conferencing may offer similar clinical benefits to that of in-person care while saving patients and caregivers 100 miles of travel and 3 hours of time per visit.<sup>11</sup> Multidisciplinary care, including speech therapy,<sup>29</sup> mental health care, and “tele-rehabilitation”<sup>30</sup> can also be delivered remotely.

## Emerging home-based care models

Emerging care models will combine remote monitoring, self-monitoring, and multi-disciplinary care to enable the provision of patient-centered care at home and decrease the

need for in-clinic assessments. Remote monitoring from devices, such as wearable sensors,<sup>31</sup> smart beds, wall-mounted cameras, smart glasses, and even utensils, can monitor a patient's symptoms and function objectively in their environment, facilitating the delivery of highly personalized care.<sup>32,33</sup> These devices increasingly form the "Internet of Things,"<sup>34</sup> a network of objects that can collect and exchange data, and can measure relevant outcomes (e.g., physical activity, sleep, falls) that are hard to assess using traditional questionnaires or personal interviews.

Issues such as feasibility (can patients manage these new devices?), compliance (can patients handle prolonged use of wearable sensors?), and validity (do the devices capture clinically relevant information that inform care?) remain to be addressed, but the initial experience is positive, provided that patients are fully informed and engaged from the outset.<sup>31</sup> Wearable devices will also shift current snapshot measurements in the clinic into a more constant flow of measurements in the comfort of the patient's own surroundings, allowing for more ecologically valid observations.

In addition, the increasing ubiquity of smartphones is enabling self-management by patients through self-monitoring apps.<sup>35</sup> These apps allow patients to record symptoms and signs, track progression, and identify warning signals that may necessitate a clinical follow-up. When integrated with the hospital-based electronic health record, these data will provide feedback to the clinician to guide treatment decisions and improve health outcomes. When combined with online education, such as a web-based, informative, and interactive television program (e.g., [www.ParkinsonTV.nl](http://www.ParkinsonTV.nl)) or social media-based community building,<sup>3</sup> remote monitoring tools can increase the ability of individuals with PD "to adapt and self-manage," a new definition of health.<sup>36</sup>

Finally, multidisciplinary care both in-person and remotely can be delivered into the home. The combination of in-person consultations in the home (e.g., to develop personal relationships or to conduct detailed examinations) and remote consultations in the home (e.g., to provide ongoing care) could meet the needs of patients.<sup>37</sup> Such a combination of in-person and virtual house calls can reveal information that is not easily observed in clinic, where patients often perform very differently compared to their usual behavior at home. These house calls can also provide valuable insights into a patient's domestic circumstances (e.g., safety of physical environment, level of social support). Specialized Parkinson's nurses, who have a broad perspective and can act as liaison to other healthcare professionals within the team, have already begun offering house calls.<sup>20</sup> In an ideal situation, such Parkinson's nurses could leave the clinic as agents of integrated regional networks of professionals specialized in PD. House calls are also important for other PD professionals, including physiotherapists (e.g., to help patients learn to transfer from their own beds) and occupational therapists (e.g., to remove domestic hazards). Current professional guidelines, for example, recommend that certain assessments (e.g., transfers) are best done at home.<sup>38</sup> Finally, some remote care could be delivered asynchronously with information flowing from patients to clinicians and advice being delivered from clinicians to patients or other clinicians.<sup>39,40</sup>

## Overcoming barriers

Several barriers, including reimbursement, access to technology, and limited evidence, can slow the migration of care to the home. Currently, major insurers, including Medicare (the universal health insurer for older Americans), incent institution-based care by paying more for care rendered in institutions than in the home. Organizations that have integrated delivery and financing of health care can benefit from cost savings from home-based care and thus are likely to be early adopters of this patient-centered model. In the U.S., the Department of Veterans Affairs<sup>28</sup> and Medicare Advantage programs<sup>41</sup> have implemented home-based care models. Kaiser Permanente, a large integrated health system in the U.S., uses internet, mobile, and, more recently, video technology to improve outcomes and increase convenience for its patients.<sup>42,43</sup> In the Netherlands, ParkinsonNet is developing an integrated reimbursement system to assist their network approach of care delivery, which includes many telehealth solutions as video consultations and online platforms for patients. Countries with single payer health systems, like Canada, Norway, or Luxemburg, are also poised to realize the advantages of home-based care for PD. Likewise, across Europe, consumer choice and flexibility have become a major goal of modern home-based care systems.<sup>44</sup> However, funding for these systems remains a challenge because hospitals lose income in a “fee-for-service” model by facilitating care outside the hospital.

The digital divide,<sup>45</sup> the differential access to internet and telecommunication technologies based on economic and social factors, prevents the use of technology to receive care at home. Individuals who are older and have more chronic conditions are less likely to use the internet,<sup>46,47</sup> and the digital divide has hampered efforts to use technology to deliver PD care at home.<sup>48</sup> The divide can be overcome by delivering in-person home care to individuals with PD,<sup>49</sup> providing remote care via satellite clinics close to one’s home as is done in Canada,<sup>22,37</sup> engaging children in the care of their parents, and increasing access to telecommunication technologies. The digital divide is narrowing and the increasing ubiquity of smartphones, which are projected to be in the hands of 90% of individuals over age 6 by 2020,<sup>50</sup> provides a promising avenue to increase access to care, especially in resource limited countries like China and India.<sup>51</sup>

Despite its promise, evidence for these new, home-based care programs is needed. Some of that evidence is being gathered currently,<sup>48</sup> and some is being generated in other chronic conditions.<sup>19,52</sup> Preliminary interest in these models for PD is robust. For example, over 11,000 individuals from 80 countries and all 50 U.S. states visited a recruitment website for a randomized controlled trial of virtual house calls for PD.<sup>48</sup>

Notwithstanding the barriers, “[it] seems inevitable that health care is going home.”<sup>19</sup> Ushering in the next generation of home care will require collective efforts from patients, families, clinicians, advocates, philanthropists, insurers, technology firms, and policy makers. Unless these models gain more visibility, these stakeholders will remain ignorant of opportunities to develop, fund, evaluate, and advocate for models to improve care. To bridge the chasm identified by the Institute of Medicine, we need to be more critical of our current care models, more willing to experiment with disruptive ones, and more prepared to refine

them. The more clearly we envision and adopt these future models, the sooner the growing number of individuals with PD will realize their benefits.

## Acknowledgments

### Financial disclosures for the preceding 12 months:

E.R.D. has stock options in Grand Rounds, has served as a consultant to the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Clintrex, MC10, Shire, and MedAvante, provided medico-legal advice, and has received research funding from AMC Health, Davis Phinney Foundation, Greater Rochester Health Foundation, Great Lakes Neurotechnologies, Huntington Study Group, Michael J. Fox Foundation, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, National Science Foundation, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, Prana Biotechnology, Raptor Pharmaceuticals, Roche, Safra Foundation, Sage Bionetworks, and Teva Pharmaceuticals.

K.K. has served as a consultant to the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, the National Institutes of Health, Acorda, Astellas Pharma, AstraZeneca, Auspex, BioMarin Pharmaceutica, Biotie, Britannia, Cangene, CHDI, Civitas, Clearpoint Strategy Group, Clintrex, Corium International, Cynapsus, Forward Pharma, Genzyme, INC Research, Intec, Isis, Lilly, Lundbeck, Medavante, Medivation, Melior Discovery, Neuroderm, Neurmedix, Omeros, Orion Pharma, Otsuka, Pfizer, Pharma2B, Prana Biotechnology, Prothena/Neotope/Elan Pharmaceutical, Raptor Pharmaceuticals, Remedy Pharmaceuticals, Roche/Genentech, Sage Bionetworks, Sanofi Serina, Stealth Peptides, Sunovion, Synagile, Teikoku Pharma, Titan, Turing Pharmaceuticals, Upsher-Smith, US WorldMeds, Vaccinex, Vertex Pharmaceuticals, Voyager, and Weston Brain Institute, and has received research support from National Institutes of Health (NEI, NINDS, NIA, NICHD), Michael J. Fox Foundation, and Teva Pharmaceuticals.

K.M.B. has served as a consultant for KJT and UCB and has received research funding from AMC Health, Michael J. Fox Foundation, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, National Parkinson Foundation, Lundbeck, Huntington's Disease Society of America, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, and Greater Rochester Health Foundation.

B.R.B. currently serves as Associate Editor for the Journal of Parkinson's disease, serves as editorial board member of Physiotherapy Canada, has received honoraria from serving on the scientific advisory board for Danone and Zambon, has received fees for speaking at conferences from AbbVie and Teva, and received research support from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, the Michael J Fox Foundation, the Prinses Beatrix Foundation, the Stichting Parkinson Fonds, the National Parkinson Foundation, the Hersenstichting Nederland and the Parkinson Vereniging.

### Funding sources for the manuscript

The preparation of this report was supported in part by the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (P20 NS092529). Floris Vlaanderen was supported by a Celsus research grant of the Dutch Ministry of Health. Prof. Bas Bloem and Dr. Biglan were supported by a research grant of the National Parkinson Foundation.

## References

1. Bloem BR, Stocchi F. Move for change part I: a European survey evaluating the impact of the EPDA Charter for People with Parkinson's disease. *Eur J Neurol.* 2012; 19(3):402–410. [PubMed: 21967281]
2. Willis AW, Schootman M, Evanoff BA, Perlmutter JS, Racette BA. Neurologist care in Parkinson disease: a utilization, outcomes, and survival study. *Neurology.* 2011; 77(9):851–857. [PubMed: 21832214]
3. Bloem BR, Munneke M. Revolutionising management of chronic disease: the ParkinsonNet approach. *BMJ.* 2014; 348
4. Institute of Medicine (U.S.). Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press; 2001. Committee on Quality of Health Care in America.
5. Gerlach OH, Winogrodzka A, Weber WE. Clinical problems in the hospitalized Parkinson's disease patient: systematic review. *Mov Disord.* 2011; 26(2):197–208. [PubMed: 21284037]

6. Aminoff MJ, Christine CW, Friedman JH, et al. Management of the hospitalized patient with Parkinson's disease: current state of the field and need for guidelines. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2011; 17(3):139–145. [PubMed: 21159538]
7. Miyasaki JM, Long J, Mancini D, et al. Palliative care for advanced Parkinson disease: an interdisciplinary clinic and new scale, the ESAS-PD. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2012; 18 (Suppl 3):S6–9. [PubMed: 22867994]
8. Willis AW, Schootman M, Tran R, et al. Neurologist-associated reduction in PD-related hospitalizations and health care expenditures. *Neurology*. 2012; 79(17):1774–1780. [PubMed: 23054239]
9. van der Eijk M, Faber MJ, Al Shamma S, Munneke M, Bloem BR. Moving towards patient-centered healthcare for patients with Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2011; 17(5):360–364. [PubMed: 21396874]
10. van der Eijk M, Faber MJ, Post B, et al. Capturing patients' experiences to change Parkinson's disease care delivery: a multicenter study. *J Neurol*. 2015; 262(11):2528–2538. [PubMed: 26292793]
11. Dorsey ER, Venkataraman V, Grana MJ, et al. Randomized controlled clinical trial of "virtual house calls" for Parkinson disease. *JAMA neurology*. 2013; 70(5):565–570. [PubMed: 23479138]
12. Safarpour D, Thibault DP, DeSanto CL, et al. Nursing home and end-of-life care in Parkinson disease. *Neurology*. 2015; 85(5):413–419. [PubMed: 26138947]
13. The European Parkinson's disease Standards of Care Consensus Statement. 2011; I [http://alt.kompetenznetz-parkinson.de/EPDA\\_Parkinson\\_s\\_Standard\\_nsus\\_Statement\\_Vol\\_I.pdf](http://alt.kompetenznetz-parkinson.de/EPDA_Parkinson_s_Standard_nsus_Statement_Vol_I.pdf). Accessed June 6, 2016.
14. Stocchi F, Bloem BR. Move for Change Part II: a European survey evaluating the impact of the EPDA Charter for people with Parkinson's disease. *Eur J Neurol*. 2013; 20(3):461–472. [PubMed: 23034057]
15. Dorsey ER, Willis AW. Caring for the majority. *Mov Disord*. 2013; 28(3):261–262. [PubMed: 23400890]
16. Nicoletti A, Sofia V, Bartoloni A, et al. Prevalence of Parkinson's disease: a door-to-door survey in rural Bolivia. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2003; 10(1):19–21. [PubMed: 14499202]
17. van der Marck MA, Bloem BR, Borm GF, Overeem S, Munneke M, Guttman M. Effectiveness of multidisciplinary care for Parkinson's disease: a randomized, controlled trial. *Mov Disord*. 2013; 28(5):605–611. [PubMed: 23165981]
18. Meyer GS, Gibbons RV. House calls to the elderly—a vanishing practice among physicians. *N Engl J Med*. 1997; 337(25):1815–1820. [PubMed: 9400040]
19. Landers SH. Why Health Care Is Going Home. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2010; 363(18):1690–1691. [PubMed: 20961239]
20. Jolly, J. Wired Well. Vol. 2015. The New York Times The New York Times Company; 2015. An Uber for Doctor Housecalls.
21. Cryer L, Shannon SB, Van Amsterdam M, Leff B. Costs for 'hospital at home' patients were 19 percent lower, with equal or better outcomes compared to similar inpatients. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2012; 31(6):1237–1243. [PubMed: 22665835]
22. Achey M, Aldred JL, Aljehani N, et al. The past, present, and future of telemedicine for Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2014; 29(7):871–883. [PubMed: 24838316]
23. Dorsey ER, Constantinescu R, Thompson JP, et al. Projected number of people with Parkinson disease in the most populous nations, 2005 through 2030. *Neurology*. 2007; 68(5):384–386. [PubMed: 17082464]
24. Health Care's Big Spenders: The Characteristics Behind the Curve. 2016
25. Olanow CW, Kieburtz K, Odin P, et al. Continuous intrajejunal infusion of levodopa-carbidopa intestinal gel for patients with advanced Parkinson's disease: a randomised, controlled, double-blind, double-dummy study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2014; 13(2):141–149. [PubMed: 24361112]
26. Levitz J. Communities Struggle to Care for Elderly, Alone at Home: More people age at home, raising demand for support services. *The Wall Street Journal*.
27. Perrin, A.; Duggan, M. Americans' Internet Access: 2000–2015. Jun 26. 2015 <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/06/26/americans-internet-access-2000-2015/>. Accessed April 5, 2016

28. Darkins A, Ryan P, Kobb R, et al. Care Coordination/Home Telehealth: the systematic implementation of health informatics, home telehealth, and disease management to support the care of veteran patients with chronic conditions. *Telemed J E Health*. 2008; 14(10):1118–1126. [PubMed: 19119835]
29. Constantinescu G, Theodoros D, Russell T, Ward E, Wilson S, Wootton R. Treating disordered speech and voice in Parkinson's disease online: a randomized controlled non-inferiority trial. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*. 2011; 46(1):1–16. [PubMed: 21281410]
30. Bloem BR, de Vries NM, Ebersbach G. Nonpharmacological treatments for patients with Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2015; 30(11):1504–1520. [PubMed: 26274930]
31. Ferreira JJ, Godinho C, Santos AT, et al. Quantitative home-based assessment of Parkinson's symptoms: the SENSE-PARK feasibility and usability study. *BMC Neurol*. 2015; 15:89. [PubMed: 26059091]
32. Espay AJ, Bonato P, Nahab FB, et al. Technology in Parkinson's disease: Challenges and opportunities. *Mov Disord*. 2016
33. Maetzler W, Domingos J, Srulijes K, Ferreira JJ, Bloem BR. Quantitative wearable sensors for objective assessment of Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2013; 28(12):1628–1637. [PubMed: 24030855]
34. Pasluosta CF, Gassner H, Winkler J, Klucken J, Eskofier BM. An Emerging Era in the Management of Parkinson's Disease: Wearable Technologies and the Internet of Things. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform*. 2015; 19(6):1873–1881. [PubMed: 26241979]
35. Arora S, Venkataraman V, Zhan A, et al. Detecting and monitoring the symptoms of Parkinson's disease using smartphones: A pilot study. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2015; 21(6):650–653. [PubMed: 25819808]
36. Huber M, Knottnerus JA, Green L, et al. How should we define health? *BMJ*. 2011; 343
37. Qiang JK, Marras C. Telemedicine in Parkinson's disease: A patient perspective at a tertiary care centre. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2015; 21(5):525–528. [PubMed: 25791380]
38. Keus, S.; Munneke, M.; Graziano, M., et al. European Physiotherapy Guideline for Parkinson's Disease. KNGF/ParkinsonNet. 2014. [http://parkinsonnet.nl/documents1029384756/eu\\_guideline\\_parkinson\\_guideline.pdf](http://parkinsonnet.nl/documents1029384756/eu_guideline_parkinson_guideline.pdf)
39. Cubo, E. Task Force on Telemedicine. <http://www.movementdisorders.org/MDS/About/Committees--Other-Groups/MDS-Task-Forces/Task-Force-on-Telemedicine.htm>. Accessed Jun 9, 2016
40. Wilson LS, Maeder AJ. Recent Directions in Telemedicine: Review of Trends in Research and Practice. *Healthc Inform Res*. 2015; 21(4):213–222. [PubMed: 26618026]
41. Tompkins, CHA.; Perloff, J.; Veselovskiy, G. Population Health Management In Medicare Advantage. Vol. 2013. Health Affairs Blog; 2013.
42. Pearl R. Kaiser Permanente Northern California: current experiences with internet, mobile, and video technologies. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2014; 33(2):251–257. [PubMed: 24493768]
43. Vlaanderen, FP.; Jeurissen, PPT.; Faber, MJ.; Munneke, M.; Bloem, BR. The Dutch outcome-based payment model of ParkinsonNet: a case study. Paris: 2016. In print
44. Colombo, F. Help wanted?: providing and paying for long-term care. Paris: OECD; 2011. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
45. Norris, P. Digital divide: civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press; 2001.
46. Smith, A. Older Adults and Technology Use: Adoption is increasing, but many seniors remain isolated from digital life. 2014. [http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2014/04/PIP\\_Seniors-and-Tech-Use\\_040314.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2014/04/PIP_Seniors-and-Tech-Use_040314.pdf). Accessed Jun 9, 2016
47. Fox, S.; Purcell, K. Chronic Disease and the Internet. 2010. [http://www.pewinternet.org/files/old-media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP\\_Chronic\\_Disease\\_with\\_topline.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/files/old-media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP_Chronic_Disease_with_topline.pdf). Accessed Jun 6, 2016
48. Dorsey ER, Achey MA, Beck CA, et al. National Randomized Controlled Trial of Virtual House Calls for People with Parkinson's Disease: Interest and Barriers. *Telemed J E Health*. 2016
49. Hack N, Akbar U, Monari EH, et al. Person-Centered Care in the Home Setting for Parkinson's Disease: Operation House Call Quality of Care Pilot Study. *Parkinsons Dis*. 2015; 2015:639494. [PubMed: 26078912]



50. Dorsey ER, Topol EJ. The State of Telehealth. *N Engl J Med*. 2016 In print.
51. Tian M, Ajay VS, Dunzhu D, et al. A Cluster-Randomized, Controlled Trial of a Simplified Multifaceted Management Program for Individuals at High Cardiovascular Risk (SimCard Trial) in Rural Tibet, China, and Haryana, India. *Circulation*. 2015; 132(9):815–824. [PubMed: 26187183]
52. Power A, Ashby D. Haemodialysis: hospital or home? *Postgrad Med J*. 2014; 90(1060):92–97. [PubMed: 24222691]
53. Kent, L. Where do the oldest Americans live?. 2015. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/07/09/where-do-the-oldest-americans-live/>. Accessed Jun 9, 2016
54. Santos-Garcia D, de la Fuente-Fernandez R. Factors contributing to caregivers' stress and burden in Parkinson's disease. *Acta Neurol Scand*. 2015; 131(4):203–210. [PubMed: 25212106]
55. Crizzle AM, Classen S, Uc EY. Parkinson disease and driving: an evidence-based review. *Neurology*. 2012; 79(20):2067–2074. [PubMed: 23150533]
56. Parkinson J. An essay on the shaking palsy. 1817. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2002; 14(2): 223–236. discussion 222. [PubMed: 11983801]
57. Aarsland D, Bronnick K, Larsen JP, Tysnes OB, Alves G, Norwegian ParkWest Study G. Cognitive impairment in incident, untreated Parkinson disease: the Norwegian ParkWest study. *Neurology*. 2009; 72(13):1121–1126. [PubMed: 19020293]
58. Dorsey ER, Deuel LM, Voss TS, et al. Increasing access to specialty care: a pilot, randomized controlled trial of telemedicine for Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2010; 25(11):1652–1659. [PubMed: 20533449]
59. Martinez-Martin P, Forjaz MJ, Frades-Payo B, et al. Caregiver burden in Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2007; 22(7):924–931. quiz 1060. [PubMed: 17238193]

**Table**

How different care models meet the needs of individuals with Parkinson disease

<b>Feature</b>	<b>Individuals with Parkinson disease</b>	<b>Current care models</b>	<b>Home-based care</b>
Location	Primarily suburban and rural areas <sup>53</sup>	Primarily urban centers	Where the individual is located
Driving	Impaired ability <sup>54,55</sup>	Usually requires driving	Little or no driving required <sup>37</sup>
Mobility	Limited <sup>56</sup>	Generally required to access care	Not required to access care
Cognition	Frequently impaired <sup>57</sup>	Often demanding to navigate	Less demanding to receive
Disease course	Progressive <sup>56</sup>	Least accessible for those with the most advanced disease	Accessible to those with greatest need <sup>58</sup>
Caregivers	Burdened <sup>59</sup>	Increases the burden	Can reduce the burden

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript