Cases of Note features peer-reviewed case reports and case series that document clinically relevant findings from critical and high acuity care environments. Cases that illuminate a clinical diagnosis or a management issue in the treatment of critically and acutely ill patients and include discussion of the patient’s experience with the illness or intervention are encouraged.

**EARLY MOBILITY ACTIVITIES DURING CONTINUOUS RENAL REPLACEMENT THERAPY**

By Cherylynn A. Brownback, RN, BSN, CCRN, Patricia Fletcher, RN, BSN, CCRN-CMC, Lynelle N. B. Pierce, RN, MSN, CCRN, CCNS, and Susan Klaus, RN, PhD

**Abstract** Continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) is a therapeutic technique used to support critically ill patients with acute renal failure in intensive care units. CRRT is preferred over hemodialysis for patients who cannot tolerate the rapid fluid and electrolyte shifts associated with hemodialysis because of their tenuous hemodynamic state. Traditionally, such patients have not been candidates for mobilization and have remained on strict bed rest. Mobilization is now being initiated on patients undergoing CRRT in intensive care units. This case study chronicles the successful mobilization of a patient undergoing CRRT. This experience suggests that CRRT patients who are appropriate candidates may be mobilized safely and therefore should not automatically be excluded from mobilization therapies. ([American Journal of Critical Care. 2014;23:348-352](http://dx.doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2014889))

**Notice to CNE enrollees:**
A closed-book, multiple-choice examination following this article tests your understanding of the following objectives:

1. Describe the complications associated with prolonged bed rest and the potential benefits of instituting early mobility activities in critically ill patients.
2. Identify barriers to progressive mobility for patients undergoing continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT).
3. Discuss considerations for determining which patients are appropriate candidates for early mobility activities while undergoing CRRT and ideas for accomplishing mobilization of these patients safely.

To read this article and take the CNE test online, visit [www.ajcconline.org](http://www.ajcconline.org) and click “CNE Articles in This Issue.” No CNE test fee for AACN members.
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quality of life. \(^4\) Patients undergoing CRRT at The University of Kansas Hospital were traditionally not considered for progressive mobility because of potential hemodynamic instability, safety risks, and the technical aspects of the therapy. Studies have suggested that mobilizing patients in the intensive care unit may be safe and beneficial in reducing the ill effects of immobility. \(^2,4\) Only recently have patients undergoing CRRT been the explicit focus of mobility studies. \(^7\) This case study describes the successful mobilization of a patient who refused to be on bed rest during CRRT. Successful mobilization was defined as the ability to move the patient without an interruption of CRRT, no significant change from baseline vital signs, and with no intolerance reported by the patient. Although this case consists predominantly of nursing efforts to mobilize a complex patient, interprofessional efforts toward comprehensive recovery from critical illness have resulted in improved patient outcomes. \(^4,6\) To ensure patients’ anonymity, certain nonessential demographic characteristics have been modified. This case report was evaluated by the local institutional review board, which determined that it fell outside the definition of human subjects research.

**Case Report**

A 55-year-old obese man with a history of congestive heart failure sought medical attention after noting a 15-pound (6.75 kg) weight gain at home. He was admitted to a progressive care unit for management of congestive heart failure. Shortly after his arrival in the unit, he became short of breath and was transferred to the intensive care unit. That same evening, a temporary hemodialysis catheter was placed in the patient’s left femoral vein and hemodialysis was immediately started to correct a potassium level of 8.0 mEq/L in the setting of acute renal failure. A blood pressure of 74/51 mm Hg complicated the delivery of therapy and hemodialysis was suspended.

Hemodialysis was again attempted on hospital day 2. Once more, the patient had hypotension develop, with a blood pressure of 74/42 mm Hg. Therefore the decision was made to initiate CRRT. On the third day of CRRT (hospital day 4), at the request of the nephrology service, the hemodialysis access in the left femoral site was discontinued and replaced with a right internal jugular access. The following morning, the patient needed to be moved to a new bed because of mechanical failure of the head-of-bed elevation feature. To facilitate moving the patient to the new bed, the nursing staff assisted the patient to a sitting position on the edge of the bed with the feet dangling and then advanced to a standing position, all while he was undergoing CRRT. The patient remained alert, cooperative, and hemodynamically stable during the activity. Just before the activity, the nurse reported the patient’s musculoskeletal status as intact, the absence of abnormalities, and that the patient was assisting with active range of motion.

Before admission, the patient was independent with activities of daily living. Because of his obesity, he had difficulty getting around the house, but he denied the use of ambulatory assistive devices. The patient expressed to the attending physician the desire to get out of bed, prompting an activity order to be placed allowing standing and transfer to chair. On days 4 and 5, while the patient was undergoing CRRT, he stood and took several steps to the chair, where he sat up for 5 hours, tolerating the activity without any complications. Three nurses assisted with mobilizing the patient, including a nurse assigned to ensuring the security of the patient’s CRRT circuit. Throughout the episode, a registered nurse provided constant observation of the security of the tubing and adequacy of flow. CRRT was discontinued on day 6, but was restarted later in the day to correct an increasing creatinine level of 3.0 mg/dL (to convert creatinine level to micromoles per liter, multiply by 88.4). The patient continued to get out of bed to the chair and commode with the assistance of nurses on days 7 and 8. Throughout the total of 9 days of CRRT, the patient underwent 11 episodes of out-of-bed activity with no CRRT interruptions, device dislodgements, or hemodynamic complications (see Figure).

On hospital day 10, after a consultation with the critical care clinical nurse specialist and nephrologists, the patient’s activity order was changed to strict bed rest. These team members, new on the service and unaware of how the patient had been mobilizing without complications, expressed concern regarding the logistics and lack of evidence supporting mobilization of patients undergoing CRRT. Therefore the institution’s current mobility standard excluding patients undergoing CRRT was...

---
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**The out-of-bed activity resulted in no hemodynamic complications or interruptions of continuous renal replacement therapy.**
with adverse effects on cardiovascular, pulmonary, musculoskeletal, neuroendocrine, hematological, and metabolic body systems.5,9 Providers are now increasingly realizing the benefits of mobility for patients in intensive care units, despite the barriers that make mobilizing complex patients difficult.5,6 Furthermore, patients discharged from the intensive care unit have been reported to have major physical impairments with decreased functional status and slow recovery.10 Practitioners increasingly consider preservation of the patient’s functional status after leaving the intensive care unit as an important outcome goal. This case study, although not assumed to represent all patients requiring CRRT, demonstrated that nurses can safely and successfully mobilize patients who were previously considered ineligible for mobilization at this institution.

Research has shown that early mobilization is a safe and effective practice in the intensive care unit; adverse events such as desaturation or ventilator asynchrony that resulted in cessation of activity reinstituted. When the patient was informed that he was to remain in the bed, he became very upset and decided that he would not participate in physical therapy interventions or eat until he spoke with the nephrology team. Additionally, he refused to be on CRRT any longer if he was not going to be allowed to get out of bed to the chair. At that time, the intensive care unit and nephrology teams conferred and made the decision to stop CRRT and the patient was successfully transitioned to hemodialysis.

The patient was subsequently transferred out of the intensive care unit 3 days after stopping CRRT and discharged home 6 days later with a hemodialysis catheter in place.

**Discussion**

Clinicians have known for decades that bed rest is associated with significant complications such as orthostatic intolerance, reduction in the cardiac reserve, muscle wasting, pulmonary embolus, and deep vein thrombosis.6 Bed rest is also associated with adverse effects on cardiovascular, pulmonary, musculoskeletal, neuroendocrine, hematological, and metabolic body systems.5,9 Providers are now increasingly realizing the benefits of mobility for patients in intensive care units, despite the barriers that make mobilizing complex patients difficult.5,6 Furthermore, patients discharged from the intensive care unit have been reported to have major physical impairments with decreased functional status and slow recovery.10 Practitioners increasingly consider preservation of the patient’s functional status after leaving the intensive care unit as an important outcome goal. This case study, although not assumed to represent all patients requiring CRRT, demonstrated that nurses can safely and successfully mobilize patients who were previously considered ineligible for mobilization at this institution.

Research has shown that early mobilization is a safe and effective practice in the intensive care unit; adverse events such as desaturation or ventilator asynchrony that resulted in cessation of activity...
occurred during 4% of episodes but did not have serious consequences.4,14 In a case study of ambulation in intensive care units, a patient with multiple invasive devices along with mechanical ventilation was successfully and safely ambulated.11

Potential limitations to progressive mobility have been the presence of life-supporting invasive devices including dialysis catheters, central catheters, endotracheal tubes, arterial catheters, or vascular access devices.2 There has been concern over the potential dislodgement of these important devices, resulting in reluctance to initiate progressive mobility.11 Recent evidence has suggested that patients receiving mechanical ventilation are able to be safely mobilized.4 More recently, patients with femoral vascular access devices safely received physical therapy that included standing, sitting, and cycling while in the intensive care unit.13 Patients who are mobilized in the intensive care unit have fewer ventilator days and are more likely to return to independent functional status.4 The mobility barriers for patients undergoing CRRT include risk to the hemodialysis catheter that is accessed and attached to an extracorporeal circuit at all times, along with the potential to disrupt flow, leading to clotting of the circuit and interruption of therapy. In addition, other barriers to consider include disease severity, cognitive state and ability to follow commands, adequate staff to assist, and equipment that is needed for the mobilization. In a study to evaluate the impact of prone positioning on 42 patients undergoing CRRT, no patients experienced inadvertent cannula removal, and only 2 patients had flow-related issues, 1 of which was related to the prone positioning.14 In another study, patients with femoral arterial catheters participated in standing, sitting, transferring to the chair, and ambulation. None of the patients experienced any catheter-related adverse events.15

Mobilizing patients receiving CRRT does present some challenges. However, as more evidence points to the safety and feasibility of mobilization, all patients who are safely mobilized may experience improved functional status and shorter stays in the intensive care unit. This case report illustrates the successful mobilization of a patient undergoing CRRT that ultimately improved the patient’s hospitalization. Beyond this single experience, nurses should employ the expertise of their interprofessional colleagues to maximize the functional benefits of mobility to critically ill patients. Future research is needed to discover the benefits and risks of implementing this intervention in all qualifying patients undergoing CRRT. In addition, the critical care team at our institution is reviewing the current policy on critical care mobility to consider expansion of inclusion criteria and undertaking initiatives to remove cultural barriers to aggressive mobilization of critically ill patients.
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