Full Title: When two communication differences intersect: Comparing inpatient rehabilitation care and outcomes for people with post-stroke aphasia who do and do not require an interpreter.

Authors:

Kathleen Mellahn <sup>1,2</sup> MSpeechPath; A/Prof Monique Kilkenny, <sup>3,4</sup> PhD; Samantha Siyambalapitiya<sup>5</sup> PhD; Ali Lakhani <sup>6</sup> PhD; Catherine Burns<sup>3</sup> M HIM, M HIth Sci (Osteo); Prof Dominique A. Cadilhac<sup>1,3,4</sup> PhD; Prof Miranda L. Rose <sup>1,2</sup> PhD

# Affiliations:

<sup>1</sup>Centre of Research Excellence in Aphasia Recovery and Rehabilitation, Bundoora, Australia; <sup>2</sup>School of Allied Health, Human Services and Sport, College of Science, Health and Engineering, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia; <sup>3</sup>Department of Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Australia; <sup>4</sup>The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, University of Melbourne, Heidelberg, Australia; <sup>5</sup>School of Health Sciences and Social Work, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Australia; <sup>6</sup>School of Psychology and Public Health, College of Science, Health and Engineering, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia.

Short Title: Needing an interpreter affects stroke aphasia rehab

**Corresponding author:** Kathleen Mellahn E:mail <u>k.mellahn@latrobe.edu.au</u> Address:

Room 213, Health Sciences Building 1, La Trobe University, 1 Kingsbury Dr, Bundoora Vic 3086

Word Count: 5999, abstract 298

# ABSTRACT

Background: Communicative ability after stroke influences patient outcomes. Limited research has explored the impact of aphasia when it intersects with cultural or linguistic differences on receiving stroke care and patient outcomes. We investigated associations between requiring an interpreter and the provision of evidence-based stroke care and outcomes for people with aphasia in the inpatient rehabilitation setting.

Methods: Patient-level data from people with aphasia were aggregated from the Australian Stroke Foundation National Stroke Audit - Rehabilitation Services (2016-2020). Multivariable regression models compared adherence to processes of care (e.g. home assessment complete, type of aphasia management) and in-hospital outcomes (e.g. length of stay, discharge destination) by requirement of an interpreter. Outcome models were adjusted for sex, stroke type, hospital size, year, and stroke severity factors.

Results: Among 3160 people with aphasia (median age 76, 56% male), 208 (7%) required an interpreter (median age 77, 52% male). The interpreter group had more severe disability on admission, reflected by reduced cognitive (6% vs 12%, p<0.000) and motor FIM scores (6% vs 12%, p<0.009). The interpreter group were less likely to have phonological and semantic interventions for their aphasia (OR 0.56, 95% CI 0.40, 0.78) compared to people not requiring an interpreter. They more often had a carer (OR 2.03, 95% CI 1.41, 2.96) and were less likely to have a home assessment prior to discharge (OR 0.34, 95% CI 0.12, 0.95) despite increased likelihood of discharging home with supports (OR 1.49, 95% CI 1.08, 2.05). The interpreter group had longer lengths of stay (median 31 vs 26 days, p=0.005).

Conclusion: Some processes of care and outcomes differed in inpatient rehabilitation for people with post-stroke aphasia who required an interpreter compared with those who did not. Equitable access to therapy is imperative and greater support for cultural/linguistic minorities during rehabilitation is indicated.

# INTRODUCTION

Inefficiency and breakdown in communication can impact healthcare delivery regardless of the medical presentation or clinical setting. <sup>1, 2</sup> This is particularly significant when there is discordance in communication between the service provider and the patient. Two examples of these communication differences are communication disability and having a culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) background.<sup>3-6</sup>

Aphasia is a language disorder and communication disability impacting approximately 30% of people who have a stroke. <sup>7,8</sup> People with post-stroke aphasia have greater risks of adverse events and longer lengths of stay in hospital than their peers without aphasia. <sup>3, 6, 9</sup>

Minority cultural or linguistic groups may also experience challenges to care, especially if they have limited English proficiency when treated in an English-speaking country. <sup>10-13</sup> Globalization and high levels of migration have led to increasingly multicultural populations, especially in Western countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States of America.<sup>14-17</sup> Regarding stroke care for CALD populations, Rezania et al. noted disparities in thrombolysis access, discharge destinations, and length of stay. <sup>4</sup> After hospital discharge, two studies found that post-stroke independence was less likely for those from CALD backgrounds, particularly when an interpreter was needed.<sup>10, 18</sup>

Until recently exploration of the compounded disadvantage experienced by people who have aphasia and are from a CALD population has been limited. Our previous research found differences in receiving evidence-based acute stroke care for people with aphasia who required an interpreter compared to those not requiring an interpreter.<sup>19</sup> It remains unclear if differences also exist during inpatient rehabilitation.

Investigating neurorehabilitation differences for post-stroke aphasia is crucial, given the importance of task and stimuli salience, and patient motivation on experience-dependent neuroplasticity. A double-layered communication barrier (CALD; aphasia) may significantly affect the therapeutic relationship and rehabilitation quality, potentially impeding community re-integration. <sup>20, 21</sup>

The aim of this study was to investigate associations between requiring an interpreter and the provision of evidence-based stroke care and outcomes for people with aphasia in Australian inpatient rehabilitation settings.

# METHODS

This is a cross-sectional observational study using pooled national stroke audit data that conforms to the STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Guidelines for crosssectional studies.<sup>22</sup> We used data collected in the biennial Stroke Foundation National Stroke Audit for Rehabilitation services conducted in 2016, 2018 and 2020.<sup>23-25</sup> The Audit Program comprises two components: an organizational survey completed by a trained staff member familiar with the stroke rehabilitation service; and a clinical audit questionnaire of up to 40 consecutive stroke rehabilitation admissions.<sup>26</sup> The organizational survey collects data about the structure of the stroke rehabilitation workforce and resources, and the clinical audit questionnaire extracts patient-level data concerning hospital outcomes and evidence-based clinical care – referred to as processes of care. Thorough details of the Audit Program methodology have been published previously.<sup>26</sup> The dependent variables collected were grouped into four categories: admission characteristics, discipline specific processes of care, discharge planning processes of care and in-hospital outcomes: the specific details of these can be found in Supplemental Table 1. Admission characteristics included demographic information such as age and sex; pre-transfer location; rehabilitation ward type and hospital size; stroke type; stroke severity indicators on

admission; and level of independence (modified Rankin Scale [mRS], Cognitive and Motor components of Functional independence Measure [FIM]). We gathered data on First Nations identity, although the CALD label typically excludes First Peoples. They were included here due to the criterion of requiring an interpreter. Discipline specific processes of care included assessment by allied health disciplines, and the type of management for mobility, activities of daily living (ADLs), neglect, upper limb, aphasia, and malnutrition. Discharge planning processes of care consisted of development of a discharge care plan; preparation for discharge such as carer training and home assessment; discussion about returning to driving and work; and communication and peer support on discharge such as being provided a hospital contact. In-hospital outcomes comprised complications during admission, discharge destination, independence on disability measures, and length of stay.

Consistent with our research aims, we exclusively extracted data for the patients recorded as having aphasia in the clinical audit. CALD status was identified by whether the patient required an interpreter, as country of birth and ethnicity were not collected in the Audit Program. Although this is not an ideal measure it has been used in other health research<sup>27</sup>. Aggregated data from all hospitals participating in any of the audit cycles were included.

# Data Analysis

Demographic and admission clinical information, processes of care and in-hospital outcomes for people with post-stroke aphasia were compared for patients who did and did not require an interpreter as detailed below. Where questions related to admission characteristics or in-hospital outcomes, 'not documented' or 'unknown' responses were both assumed to be negative and included in the denominator for the analysis. Records with missing responses for processes of care were considered incomplete and excluded from analysis. Data were analyzed using STATA SE 18.0 (StataCorp, Texas).

Descriptive statistics were used to characterize all variables of interest by interpreter status. Between group differences were compared using Kruskal-Wallis and chi square tests as appropriate. All statistical tests were two-sided, with level of significance at p<0.05. Demographic and admission characteristics that demonstrated a statistically significant difference, were analyzed for collinearity with factors known to influence outcomes (age, sex, pre-morbid independence [mRS 0-2] stroke type, and stroke severity [arm and mobility impairment]). Multivariable logistic regression models were used to analyze non-collinear variables for processes of care and in hospital outcomes. If collinearity was demonstrated the variable with greatest evidence for impacting stroke outcomes based on current literature would have been chosen. Audit year was included in the model as a sensitivity analysis.

The final regression model utilized in this study adjusted for age, sex, pre-morbid independence, stroke type, audit year, arm and mobility impairments, hospital size and independence on admission on each of the Cognitive and Motor components of the FIM.

When assessing between group differences for processes of care and in-hospital outcomes that had a p value of less than 0.1 on either chi square or Kruskal Wallis tests underwent multivariable, multilevel logistic regression with level defined as hospital to determine differences by interpreter status.

Random effects logistic regression was used for binary outcomes or processes of care (e.g., seen by a Physiotherapist, independence on discharge), including the outcome or process of care as a dependent variable in separate models, with level being hospital. Median regression models were used for length of stay, with clustering to account for hospital differences. Results of multivariable models were reported as adjusted odds ratios (aORs) or coefficients, and 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

# RESULTS

# Demographic and clinical characteristics

Overall, 10007 rehabilitation admissions were audited from 133 hospitals across the three audit cycles, whereby 3160 (32%) patients were documented to have aphasia. In the aphasic cohort, 208 (7%) required an interpreter.

On admission, the interpreter group were admitted to rehabilitation later after stroke onset (median 10 days vs 9 days, p=0.0038), were more likely to be admitted to a mixed rehabilitation unit (i.e. not strictly neurorehabilitation) and be admitted to hospitals that treated more than 80 stroke patients a year (Table 1). Although there were no differences in stroke type, the interpreter group were more likely to have a mobility impairment and were less likely to be independent on all three disability outcome measures (mRS, FIM Cognition and FIM Motor). The interpreter group were less likely to be employed at time of admission (10% vs 19% no interpreter) and more likely to have a carer as a support person (68% vs 48%).

Although univariable analysis found differences in proportions between groups across processes of care and in-hospital outcomes that often favored the group not requiring an interpreter, few aspects of care or outcomes remained significantly different in the multivariable analyses (Tables 1-4).

# Processes of Care

After multi-variable analysis, post-stroke impairment management was seen to be different, for neglect and aphasia management (Table 2). We found that the interpreter group were less likely to have visual scanning (aOR 0.50, 95% CI 0.28, 0.88) utilized in the management of their neglect. Those requiring an interpreter were also less likely to have phonological or semantic interventions (aOR 0.57, 95% CI 0.40, 0.80); constraint induced language therapy (aOR 0.33, 95% CI 0.15, 0.72) or group therapy (aOR 0.47, 95% CI 0.30, 0.73) than those who did not require an interpreter.

Several between group differences were found for discharge planning processes of care (Table 3). Compared to those not requiring an interpreter, the interpreter group were less likely to have a home assessment completed (aOR 0.34, 95% CI 0.12, 0.95) or be asked if they wanted to return to driving (aOR 0.33, 95% CI 0 .20, 0.55). Requiring an interpreter was associated with a decreased likelihood of being offered information about sexuality after stroke (aOR 0.45, 95% CI 0.24, 0.83) or self-management programs (aOR 0.41, 95% CI 0.18, 0.91).

# In-hospital outcomes

Compared to those not requiring an interpreter, the interpreter group were more likely to discharge home with supports (aOR 1.48, 95% CI 1.08, 2.04) and less likely to discharge to a transitional care service (aOR 0.40, 95% CI 0.17, 0.94) (Table 4). In terms of disability outcome measures, patients requiring an interpreter were less likely to be independent on all measures (mRS, FIM Cognition and FIM Motor). However, following multivariable analyses, only independence on FIM Cognition remained statistically significantly different between groups (aOR 0.48, 95% CI 0.28, 0.82).

Finally, requiring an interpreter was associated with a longer median rehabilitation stay (31 days vs. 26 days). After median regression, LOS difference remained significant: the interpreter group had a coefficient of 4.5 (p=0.007), indicating a 4.5-day longer stay than peers without interpreter needs.

# Discussion

To our knowledge, quantitative analyses comparing the inpatient rehabilitation care of people with aphasia from CALD backgrounds to their non-CALD peers have not been reported. We found that people with aphasia who required an interpreter had different clinical profiles on admission to rehabilitation. First, the interpreter group were more likely to be treated in larger hospitals in metropolitan regions which could stem from historical migration trends favoring major Australian cities. <sup>28</sup> Our data showed that people with aphasia with interpreter needs arrived at rehabilitation units later post-stroke, were more likely to have a carer, less likely to be independent on disability measures and were more likely to be unable to walk. Each of these findings align with acute research, which showed that requiring an interpreter was associated with a 2-day longer length of stay and a decreased likelihood of independence upon discharge.<sup>4, 19</sup>

Our data showed some differences in evidence-based stroke rehabilitation provision that were not attributable to differences in admission disability severity, or other confounding factors. Requiring an interpreter was associated with reduced access to impairment-based and group aphasia therapies which may be explained by the difficulty of providing communication therapy when there is a language discordance between clinician and patient.<sup>29</sup> Factors contributing to this difficulty include limited culturally and linguistically appropriate therapy resources, and logistical challenges in coordinating interpreters. Differences in care extended beyond speech pathology with the interpreter group being half as likely to receive visual scanning for the management of neglect, typically managed by Occupational Therapists.<sup>30, 31</sup>

Differences were also evident in discharge planning. The interpreter group were two thirds less likely to have a home assessment completed or to be asked if they wanted to return to driving. Similarly, they were less than half as likely to be offered information about sexuality after stroke or to be made aware of general self-management programs. Lack of appropriate translated resources to provide this information and assessment could hinder these processes.<sup>32</sup>

Finally, we observed significant outcome differences between groups. Requiring an interpreter was associated with a 4.5 day longer length of stay. Despite protracted admissions, the interpreter group were less independent on discharge on all three disability outcomes. For modified Rankin Scale and FIM Motor the statistical significance of this difference was explained by disability severity on admission. However, for FIM Cognition, admission disability severity could not account for differences in cognitive independence on discharge. Interpreter status influenced discharge destination, with these patients more likely to transition home with support and less likely to be discharged to a transitional care program, notwithstanding reduced rates of home assessment. This may be linked to the higher rates of available carers for the interpreter group meaning discharge home was more likely to be perceived as a viable option.

### Strengths and Limitations

Previous work has detailed the strengths and limitations of the National Stroke Audit Program data. <sup>19</sup> Strengths include its quality and representative nature; assured by a large dataset and reliable collection processes. This involves trained data abstractors, a data dictionary, and a web-based entry tool with built-in logic checks to minimize errors.

Despite these advantages, the imbalance in group sizes and retrospective, cross-sectional nature of the data may limit our findings' power. Given this data is from an Australian, largely public hospital setting, caution is needed when drawing comparisons or generalizing to stroke rehabilitation more broadly.

The main limitation of this data set is the limited options for identifying CALD status.<sup>19</sup> Additional demographic details such as country of birth, languages spoken, and parental country of birth should be collected to better differentiate CALD from non-CALD groups, allowing for a more nuanced analysis of the influence of culture and ethnicity on care. <sup>33</sup> Our research suggests that the interpreter group represent a particularly marginalized population, as they are potentially less likely to be bilingual. This may explain the small proportion of patients (7%) documented to require an interpreter when census data suggests the number of people who speak languages other than English should be closer to 20%.<sup>17</sup>

While a large range of information was extracted, gaps in our understanding of the clinical picture persist due to the limitations on data collected in the Audit Program. Specifically, we lack data on the frequency and quality of interventions, as well as whether interpreters were utilized during admission. Consequently, we cannot ascertain how the use of interpreters may influence differences in care and outcomes.

This work expands on our acute research and demonstrates that disparities in the clinical profile, provision of evidence-based care, and clinical outcomes extend into rehabilitation. <sup>19</sup> We have identified areas of compromised care quality which presents an opportunity for targeted improvement of stroke services; however, this requires further research that explores the decision-making underpinning clinicians' management of CALD people with aphasia. Furthermore, more robust clinical data on interpreter use would enhance understanding and opportunities for practice change. Research is currently underway to address these knowledge gaps.

# Conclusions

Requiring an interpreter was found to critically influence several differences in the provision of inpatient rehabilitation and in-hospital outcomes for people with post-stroke aphasia. This highlights the necessity for enhanced support for CALD people to ensure equitable access to therapy. Further research is required to explore the system-level factors driving these differences to make meaningful practice changes and prevent service inequity.

# Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the hospitals and clinicians participating in the National Stroke Audit Program.

# **Ethical approval**

Ethics approval for data used in this project was granted through the Human Research Ethics Committee from Monash University (Project ID 35037).

# **Funding Sources**

MLR acknowledges a National Health and Medical Research Council (NMHRC) Centers of Research Excellence Grant (GNT1153236).

### References

- Jarva E, Mikkonen K, Tuomikoski A-M, Kääriäinen M, Meriläinen M, Karsikas E, et al. Healthcare professionals' competence in stroke care pathways: A mixed-methods systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 2021;30:1206-1235
- 2. Mosadeghrad AM. Factors influencing healthcare service quality. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2014;3:77-89
- Stransky ML, Jensen KM, Morris MA. Adults with communication disabilities experience poorer health and healthcare outcomes compared to persons without communication disabilities. *Journal of general internal medicine*. 2018;33:2147-2155
- 4. Rezania F, Neil CJA, Wijeratne T. Disparities in care and outcome of stroke patients from culturally and linguistically diverse communities in metropolitan australia. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*. 2021;10:5870
- John-Baptiste A, Naglie G, Tomlinson G, Alibhai SMH, Etchells E, Cheung A, et al. The effect of english language proficiency on length of stay and in-hospital mortality. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2004;19:221-228
- 6. Bartlett G, Blais R, Tamblyn R, Clermont RJ, MacGibbon B. Impact of patient communication problems on the risk of preventable adverse events in acute care settings. *Cmaj.* 2008;178:1555-1562
- Engelter ST, Gostynski M, Papa S, Frei M, Born C, Ajdacic-Gross V, et al. Epidemiology of aphasia attributable to first ischemic stroke. *Stroke*. 2006;37:1379-1384
- Pedersen PM, Jørgensen HS, Nakayama H, Raaschou HO, Olsen TS. Aphasia in acute stroke: Incidence, determinants, and recovery. *Ann Neurol*. 1995;38:659-666
- 9. Wu C, Qin Y, Lin Z, Yi X, Wei X, Ruan Y, et al. Prevalence and impact of aphasia among patients admitted with acute ischemic stroke. *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*. 2020;29:104764
- Thompson SG, Barber PA, Gommans JH, Cadilhac DA, Davis A, Fink JN, et al. The impact of ethnicity on stroke care access and patient outcomes: A new zealand nationwide observational study. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac.* 2022;20:100358-100358

- 11. Seman M, Karanatsios B, Simons K, Falls R, Tan N, Wong C, et al. The impact of cultural and linguistic diversity on hospital readmission in patients hospitalized with acute heart failure. *European Heart Journal Quality of Care and Clinical Outcomes*. 2019;6:121-129
- 12. Divi C, Koss RG, Schmaltz SP, Loeb JM. Language proficiency and adverse events in us hospitals: A pilot study. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007;19:60-67
- Basic D, Shanley C, Gonzales R. The impact of being a migrant from a non-english-speaking country on healthcare outcomes in frail older inpatients: An australian study. *Journal of cross-cultural gerontology*. 2017;32:447-460
- 14. Rumbaut RG, Massey DS. Immigration and language diversity in the united states. *Daedalus*.2013;142:141-154
- 15. (ONS) OfNS. Ethnic group, england and wales: Census 2021. released 29 November 2022
- 16. Canada S. Increasing diversity of languages, other than english or french, spoken at home. 2022
- 17. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Cultural diversity: Census [internet]. 2021
- Kilkenny MF, Lannin NA, Anderson CS, Dewey HM, Kim J, Barclay-Moss K, et al. Quality of life is poorer for patients with stroke who require an interpreter: An observational australian registry study. *Stroke*.
   2018;49:761-764
- 19. Mellahn K, Kilkenny M, Siyambalapitiya S, Lakhani A, Purvis T, Reyneke M, et al. Comparing acute hospital outcomes for people with post-stroke aphasia who do and do not require an interpreter. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*.1-10
- Meadmore KL, Hallewell E, Freeman C, Hughes A-M. Factors affecting rehabilitation and use of upper limb after stroke: Views from healthcare professionals and stroke survivors. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*. 2019;26:94-100
- Kleim Jeffrey A, Jones Theresa A. Principles of experience-dependent neural plasticity: Implications for rehabilitation after brain damage. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2008;51:S225-S239

- 22. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (strobe) statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008;61:344-349
- 23. Stroke Foundation. *National stroke audit rehabilitation services report 2020*. Melbourne Australia https://strokefoundation.org.au/what-we-do/for-health-professionals/audits Accessed November 2021
- 24. Stroke Foundation. *National stroke audit rehabilitation services report 2018*. Melbourne Australia https://strokefoundation.org.au/what-we-do/for-health-professionals/audits Accessed November 2021
- 25. Stroke Foundation. *National stroke audit rehabilitation services report 2016*. Melbourne Australia https://strokefoundation.org.au/what-we-do/for-health-professionals/audits Accessed November 2021
- Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit Program Methodology. Melbourne Australia.
   https://strokefoundation.org.au/what-we-do/for-health-professionals/audits/ . Accessed November 2021
- 27. Njeru JW, Sauver JLS, Jacobson DJ, Ebbert JO, Takahashi PY, Fan C, et al. Emergency department and inpatient health care utilization among patients who require interpreter services. *BMC health services research*. 2015;15:214-214
- 28. Where do migrants live? 2014
- Pang S, Mok Z, Rose M. Time for change. *Journal of Clinical Practice in Speech-Language Pathology*.
   2015;17:20-26
- 30. Menon-Nair A, Korner-Bitensky N, Ogourtsova T. Occupational therapists' identification, assessment, and treatment of unilateral spatial neglect during stroke rehabilitation in canada. *Stroke*. 2007;38:2556-2562
- 31. Tavaszi I, Nagy AS, Szabo G, Fazekas G. Neglect syndrome in post-stroke conditions: Assessment and treatment (scoping review). *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. 2021;44
- 32. Roy DRNPF, Gasquoine SRNM, Caldwell SRNBAM, Nash DMDE. Health professional and family perceptions of post-stroke information. *Nursing Praxis in New Zealand*. 2015;31:7-24
- FECCA. Towards consistent national data collection and reporting on cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity.
   2020

	Interp	reter	No Interp	oreter
Age, median (Q1, Q3)	77 (66, 84)		75 (65, 88)	
Davs since stroke onset median (Q1, Q3)	10 (7	10 (7.20)		6)
Patient characteristics	n	%	n	%
Male	108	52	1661	56
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	10	5	83	3
Employed before stroke <sup>g</sup>	15	10	374	19
Not driving before stroke <sup>f</sup>	57	57	1206	73
Has a carer <sup>e</sup>	123	68	1219	48
Location Transferred From				
Acute Inpatient Ward	77	37	1215	41
GP referral	0	0	9	0
Acute hospital Stroke Unit	123	59	1515	51
Rehabilitation Ward	3	1	55	2
Other	5	2	139	5
Rehabilitation Ward Type	20	10	047	0
Dedicated Stroke Renab	20	10	247	ð
	18	9	230	ŏ CO
Mixed - renabilitation	155	75	2033	69
Combined acute and renab	15	1	442	15
Heapital Strake admissions per veer				
loss than 20	0	4	200	10
	0	4	203	52
SI-19	105	50 47	1004	55 27
	51	4/	1004	51
Stroke Type				
Ischemic Stroke	157	75	2210	75
Haemorrhagic Stroke	43	21	568	19
Undetermined Stroke	5	2	117	4
Severity Indicators on admission				
unable to walk independently on admission <sup>a</sup>	169	82	2151	73
sensory deficite	67	39	1150	44
cognitive deficit <sup>d</sup>	157	79	2030	73
Visual deficite	63	35	1009	38
perceptual deficite	75	44	1,142	46
hydration problems <sup>d</sup>	61	33	747	28
nutrition problems <sup>d</sup>	88	45	1215	43
Arm deficit <sup>b</sup>	145	72	2,083	72

# Table 1. Demographics and characteristics of patients with aphasia by interpreter status on admission to inpatient rehabilitation ward

at risk of malnutrition <sup>d</sup>	80	41	1209	43
Independence on Disability Measures Modified Rankin Scale* FIM Cognition\$ <sup>c</sup> FIM Motor^c	11 12 12	5 6 6	279 346 433	9 12 12
	12	0	433	12

bold font= p<0.05;

\*modified Rankin Scale score 0-2; \$ Functional Independence Measure Cognitive score 30-35; ^ Functional Independence Measure Motor score 78-91; a<1% missing/unknown data; b1-<2% missing/unknown data; c2-<5% missing/unknown data; d5-<10% missing/unknown data; e10-<20% missing/unknown data; g30-<40% missing/unknown data

# Table 2 Adherence to Discipline specific processes of care by interpreter status

Process of Care	Interpreter Required n=208		No Inte Reguired	rpreter n=2952	aOR# (95% CI)
	n	%	n.	%	
Seen by a Physiotherapist*	206	100	2904	99	Х
Seen by an Occupational Therapist*	207	100	2935	100	x
Seen by a Speech Pathologist*	203	100	2914	99	Х
Seen by Psychologist*	34	16	504	17	Х
Seen by a Social worker*	182	88	2421	82	Х
Seen by a Dietitian*	134	64	1852	63	X
Incontinence Assessed <sup>d</sup>	187	90	2504	85	0.80 (0.46, 1.38)
Mood Assessed	115	55	1740	59	X
Mobility Management included <sup>†</sup> :					
Tailored repetitive practice of walking	151	89	1943	90	x
Cueing of cadence	57	34	898	42	0.67(0.43, 1.02)
mechanically assisted gait	28	17	386	18	X
joint biofeedback	26	15	367	17	X
other therapy	101	60	1336	62	X
ADLs Management included†:					
Task specific practice	174	90	2382	92	Х
Trained use of appropriate aid	114	59	1579	61	Х
Other therapy	92	47	1224	47	x
Neglect Management included†:					
Visual scanning	43	54	636	69	0.50(0.28, 0.88)
Prism adaptation	1	1	21	2	X
Eye patching	0	0	19	2	X
Simple cues	60	75	818	88	0.51 (0.26, 1.02)
Mental imagery	11	14	165	18	X
Other therapy	25	31	360	39	x
Upper Limb Management included†:					
Constraint induced movement therapy	13	9	248	12	X
Repetitive task-specific training	120	83	1771	85	X
Mechanical assisted training	22	15	326	16	X
other therapy	80	55	1305	63	0.79 (0.52, 1.18)
Aphasia Management included†:					
	138	66	1730	59	1.11 (0.79, 1.59)
Phonological and semantic interventions	128	62	2116	72	0.57(0.40, 0.80)
Constraint induced language therapy	13	6	340	12	0.33 (0.15, 0.72)

Supported conversation techniques	162	78	2360	80	х
Therapy via computer	27	13	455	15	х
Group therapy	35	17	863	29	0.47 (0.30, 0.73)
Malnutrition Management included:					
Ongoing Monitoring by Dietitian	84	95	1132	93	х
Nutritional Supplementation	73	83	946	78	х
Alternative Feeding <sup>e</sup>	28	32	299	25	х

Bold font = p<0.05; aOR= adjusted odds ratio ; #adjusted for age, sex, pre-morbid independence, hospital size, stroke type, arm and mobility impairments, hospital size, independence Cognitive FIM, independence on Motor FIM; AAC- Augmentative and Alternative Communication\* excl declined/not required/therapist not on staff † if impairment present; a<1% missing/unknown data; b1-<2% missing/unknown data; c2-<5% missing/unknown data.

d5-<10% missing/unknown data; e10-<20% missing/unknown data; f20- <30% missing/unknown data; g30- <40% missing/unknown data.

# Table 3 Adherence to discharge planning processes of care by interpreter status

Process of Care	Interpreter n=2	r Required 208	No Interpret n=2	er Required 952	aOR# (95% CI)
Discharge Care Plan	n	%	n	%	
Developed with MDT & patient or family <sup>d</sup>	162	86	2138	81	XX
Developed with patient <sup>§g</sup>	89	79	1317	92	0.53(0.28, 1.02)
Developed with family/carer §g	106	95	1267	89	Х
Preparing for Discharge					
Carer training provided 9	98	80	883	72	1.70(0.78, 3.71)
Did the carer receive a support needs assessment	83	67.48	833	68	x
Management discussed with pt/family	195	94	2,653	90	0.97(0.48, 1.95)
Goals set with input from team/pt/family	196	94	2737	93	x
Pt/Family received info re stroke education	114	55	1,815	61	1.04(.72, 1.50)
Carer provided with info re peer support	45	37	554	45	0.73 (0.45, 1.18)
Home assessment completed ‡	16	59	240	74	0.34 (0.12, 0.95)
Driving					
Patient asked if they want to return to driving‡f	24	17	748	43	0.33 (0 .20, 0.55)
Patient wanted to return to driving‡	17	71	615	82	X
If the patient wanted to return to driving:					
Information was provided about returning to driving	15	88	555	90	х
Pt referred for driving assessment‡	6	35	186	30	Х
Return to work					
Patient asked if they want to RTW	6	40	218	58	
Patient wanted to return to work	9	11	326	25	¶
Informed of services to assist with RTW if wanting to RTW $\ddagger$	3	43	122	66	х
Was patient informed of services to assist with return to worke	7	9	221	17	¶
Communication and Peer Support on discharge					
Offered info about sexuality after stroke	21	10	672	23	0.45(0.24, 0.83)
Patient provided with info about peer support	55	26	1238	42	0.69 (0.47, 1.03)
Carer provided with info re peer support h	45	37	554	45	0.73 (0.45, 1.18)
Discharge Summary provided to GP	182	88	2,577	87	Х
In hospital contact for discharge programs provided to patient OR family – all patients	134	64	2080	70	1.27 (0.86, 1.87)
In hospital contact for discharge programs provided to patient OR family – patients who are discharged §	134	64	2059	71	1.24 (0.83, 1.83)
Patient made aware of the availability of generic self- management programs before discharge from hospital	19	30	420	49	0.41 (0.18, 0.91)

Bold font = p<0.05; aOR= adjusted odds ratio; #adjusted for age, sex, pre-morbid independence, hospital size, stroke type, arm and mobility impairments, hospital size, independence Cognitive FIM, independence on Motor FIM; \* excl declined/not required † if impairment present; ‡ if discharged to private residence; § if discharged; ¶ numbers too small to regress; § Not collected in 2016

a<1% missing/unknown data; b1-<2% missing/unknown data; c2-<5% missing/unknown data; d5-<10% missing/unknown data; e10-<20% missing/unknown data; f20-<30% missing/unknown data g30-<40% missing/unknown data; h40-<50% missing/unknown data</p>

# Table 4 In-hospital outcomes by interpreter status for people with aphasia

Outcome	Interpreter n=2	Required 08	No Interprete	r Required n=2952	aOR# (95% CI)
Complications during admission	n	%	n	%	
Deaths	0	0	43	1	Х
aspiration pneumonia	14	7	175	6	х
DVT	2	1	44	1	Х
Fall	41	20	461	16	х
Fever	24	12	279	9	Х
pressure sore	12	6	143	5	Х
shoulder subluxation	14	7	172	6	х
shoulder pain	29	14	395	12.38	Х
UTI <sup>a</sup>	36	17	474	16.09	х
Contracture	6	3	59	2	х
Malnutrition	21	10	323	10.94	х
new AF <sup>g</sup>	5	4	81	4.05	х
Discharge Destination					
Other acute hospital	13	6	296	10	0.72 (0.40, 1.32)
New residential aged care service	36	17	418	14	x
Statistical discharge (type change	8	4	102	4	х
Other	6	3	59	2	х
Left against medical advice	2	1	34	1	х
Usual residence with supports	118	57	1419	49	1.48(1.08, 2.04)
Usual residence with NO supports	15	7	279	10	Х
Inpatient rehabilitation	3	1	98	3	х
Transitional care services	7	3	204	7	0.40 (0.17, 0.94)
Independence on Disability Measures					
Modified Rankin Scale*A	77	37	1399	47	0.80 (0.52, 1.25)
FIM Cognition\$ <sup>c</sup>	25	13	740	27	0.48 (0.28, 0.82)
FIM Motor <sup>^d</sup>	62	32	1216	44	0.81 (0.55, 1.18)

	Interpreter Required n=208		No Interpreter Required n=2952		
Change in FIM	median	Q1,Q3	median	Q1,Q3	
FIM Motor <sup>^</sup>	19	7,31	17	6,30	x
FIM Cognition\$	3	0, 7	3	0, 7	Х

Length of Stay

Coefficient (95% CI)

Including Deaths	31	18, 46	26	14,42	4.5 (1.25, 7.75)
Excluding Deaths	31	18, 46	26	14,42	3 (-0.23, 6.23)

Bold font = p<0.05; aOR= adjusted odds ratio ##adjusted for age, sex, pre-morbid independence, hospital size, stroke type, arm and mobility impairments, hospital size, independence Cognitive FIM, independence on Motor FIM ; ¶ numbers too small to regress.; \* defined as modified Rankin Scale score 0-2; \$ defined as Functional Independence Measure Cognitive score 30-35; ^ defined as Functional Independence Measure Motor score 78-91; a<1% missing/unknown data; c2–<5% missing/unknown data; d5–<10% missing/unknown data; ; 9 30- <40% missing/unknown data;

# Supplemental Table S1: Variables collected for analysis

Admission Characteristics	Discipline Specific Processes of Care	Discharge Planning Processes of Care	In-Hospital Outcomes
Age	Seen by a Physiotherapist	<ul> <li>Discharge Care Plan</li> <li>Developed with MDT &amp; patient or family</li> <li>Developed with patient</li> <li>Developed with family/carer</li> </ul>	Complications during admission:
Sex	Seen by an Occupational Therapist		Death
Days since stroke onset on admission	Seen by a Speech Pathologist	Preparing for Discharge:	aspiration pneumonia
	Seen by Psychologist	Carer training provided	DVT
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	Seen by a Social worker	Did the carer receive a support needs assessment	Fall
Employed before stroke	Seen by a Dietitian	Management discussed with pt/family	Fever
Not driving before stroke	Incontinence Assessed	Goals set with input from team/pt/family	pressure sore
Has a carer	Mood Assessed	Pt/Family received info re stroke education	shoulder subluxation
		Carer provided with info re peer support	shoulder pain
<ul> <li>Location Transferred From</li> <li>Acute Inpatient Ward</li> <li>GP referral</li> <li>Acute hospital Stroke Unit</li> <li>Rehabilitation Ward</li> <li>Other</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Mobility Management included†:</li> <li>Tailored repetitive practice of walking</li> <li>Cueing of cadence</li> <li>mechanically assisted gait</li> <li>joint biofeedback</li> <li>other therapy</li> </ul>	Home assessment completed	UTI
<ul> <li>Rehabilitation Ward Type</li> <li>Rehabilitation Ward Type</li> <li>Dedicated Stroke Rehab</li> <li>Neurorehabilitation Unit</li> <li>Mixed - rehabilitation</li> <li>Combined acute and rehab</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>ADLs Management included†:</li> <li>Task specific practice</li> <li>Trained use of appropriate aid</li> <li>Other therapy</li> </ul>	Driving:	Contracture
Hospital Stroke admissions per year less than 30 31-79 more than 80	Neglect Management included†: Visual scanning Prism adaptation Eye patching Simple cues	Asked if they want to return to driving	Malnutrition

	<ul> <li>Mental imagery</li> <li>Other therapy</li> </ul>		
Stroke Type <ul> <li>Ischemic Stroke</li> <li>Haemorrhagic Stroke</li> <li>Undetermined Stroke</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Upper Limb Management included†:</li> <li>Constraint induced movement therapy</li> <li>Repetitive task-specific training</li> <li>Mechanical assisted training</li> <li>other therapy</li> </ul>	Patient wanted to return to driving	new atrial fibrillation
Severity Indicators on admission	<ul> <li>Aphasia Management included†:</li> <li>AAC</li> <li>Phonological and semantic interventions</li> <li>Constraint induced language therapy</li> <li>Supported conversation techniques</li> <li>Therapy via computer</li> <li>Group therapy</li> </ul>	If the patient wanted to return to driving:	
unable to walk independently on admission	<ul> <li>Malnutrition Management included:</li> <li>Ongoing Monitoring by Dietitian</li> <li>Nutritional Supplementation</li> <li>Alternative Feeding</li> </ul>	Information was provided about returning to driving	<ul> <li>Discharge Destination:</li> <li>Other acute hospital</li> <li>New residential aged care service</li> <li>Statistical discharge (type change</li> <li>Other</li> <li>Left against medical advice</li> <li>Usual residence with supports</li> <li>Usual residence with NO supports</li> <li>Inpatient rehabilitation</li> <li>Transitional care services</li> </ul>
sensory deficit		Pt referred for driving assessment	
cognitive deficit			Independence on Disability Measures
Visual deficit		Return to work	Modified Rankin Scale*
perceptual deficit		Patient asked if they want to RTW	FIM Cognition\$
hydration problems		Did the patient want to return to work?	FIM Motor <sup>^</sup>
nutrition problems		Informed of services to assist with RTW if wanting to RTW	
Arm deficit		Was patient informed of services to assist with return to work	Change in FIM
at risk of malnutrition			FIM Motor <sup>^</sup>
		Communication and Peer Support on discharge	FIM Cognition\$
Independence on Disability Measures		Offered info about sexuality after stroke	
Modified Rankin Scale*		Patient provided info about peer support	Length of Stay
FIM Cognition\$		Carer provided with info re peer support	
FIM Motor <sup>^</sup>		Discharge Summary provided to GP	

	Hospital contact for discharge programs given to patient		
	Hospital contact for discharge programs given to family		
	In hospital contact for discharge programs provided to patient OR family		
	Patient made aware of the availability of generic self- management programs before discharge from hospital		
bold font= p<0.05; † if impairment present ; * defined as modified Rankin Scale score 0-2; \$ defined as Functional Independence Measure Cognitive			

score 30-35; ^ defined as Functional Independence Measure Motor score 78-91;