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Background and Purpose—Depression is a common issue after stroke. A focus on assisting people to achieve their personal participation goals may reduce levels of depression. The aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of a person-centered, integrated approach on facilitating goal achievement in the first year poststroke on depressive symptoms.

Methods—This study was a randomized controlled trial that addressed ways to enhance participation in patient-valued activities and intermittently screen for adverse sequelae postdischarge from rehabilitation. Collaborative goal setting was undertaken in both groups at discharge from inpatient rehabilitation. The control group received standard management as determined by the treating team. In addition, the intervention group received a multimodal approach, including telephone contacts, screening for adverse sequelae, written information, home visits, review of goal achievement, and further referral to relevant health services. The main outcome measure was depressed mood, measured by the 15-item Geriatric Depression Scale.

Results—One hundred ten participants were recruited. No group differences were identified at baseline on any demographic and clinical variables. Using multiple linear regression analysis, there was a significant difference between the 2 groups with respect to the severity of depressive symptoms at 12 months poststroke ($R^2=0.366; F (6, 89)=8.57; P<0.005$), with the intervention group recording lower depressive scores.

Conclusions—This model of community-based rehabilitation proved effective in reducing poststroke depressive symptoms. An integrated approach using pursuit of patient-identified activities should form part of routine poststroke management.

Clinical Trial Registration—URL: http://www.anzctr.org.au. Unique identifier: ACTRN12608000042347. (Stroke. 2016;47:2820-2827. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.013081.)
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person-centered care and goal setting practices espoused as key components. The goal setting process can be used as a way to engage and motivate patients, and it has been postulated that goal attainment may potentially have implications on mood. However, the effectiveness of facilitating the pursuit of individualized goals on the outcome of PSD has not been investigated.

The aim of this study was to determine the effectiveness of a goal-focused intervention in reducing depressive symptoms 12 months poststroke. The primary hypothesis was that an integrated approach to facilitate goal achievement in the first year after stroke will result in significantly less depressive symptoms, as measured by the Geriatric Depression Scale (15 item; GDS-15), compared with a usual care group.

Methods

Study Design

This study was a prospective randomized controlled trial, with assessment of outcomes at 6 and 12 months poststroke. The participants and outcome data collectors were blinded as to group allocation. The assessments were interviewer-administered during face-to-face contacts. The protocol for this study has been registered (ANZCTR 12608000042347) and previously published in detail.

Patient Eligibility and Recruitment Process

All patients with the primary diagnosis of acute cerebrovascular accident (inclusive of cerebral infarction, intracranial hemorrhage, and subarachnoid hemorrhage) were eligible to participate in this study. Exclusion criteria were as follows: primary cause of disabilities was a diagnosis other than stroke, associated head trauma (such as fractures), epidural or subdural hemorrhage, presence of a cerebral malignancy, discharge destination to a high-level residential care facility, and an inpatient rehabilitation length of stay of <4 days’ duration or >6 months’ duration.

Randomization and Blinding

At discharge from inpatient rehabilitation admission, all study participants were randomized. Information collected included the following: depressive symptoms, GDS-15; functional status, 13 motor items of the Functional Independence Measure (FIM-Motor); self-care self-efficacy, Strategies Used by People to Promote Health; cognition, Mini-Mental State Examination; participant age, sex, type/side of stroke, history of depression (requiring specific management by a healthcare professional), use of antidepressant medications (just before inpatient admission), living arrangements, and availability of an informal carer.

Primary Outcomes

The primary outcome was the mean level of severity of depressive symptoms as measured on the summed GDS-15 scores at the 12 months poststroke time point. In addition, proportions of clinically significant depressive symptoms (caseness) were examined using the categorized GDS-15 scores (with depressive symptoms defined as ≥ 26 points). The secondary outcome data (including health-related quality of life, self-care self-efficacy, goal achievement, participation status, and carer outcomes) will be reported in future publications.

Baseline Assessments

General demographic and clinical data were collated before randomization. Information collected included the following: depressive symptoms, GDS-15; functional status, 13 motor items of the Functional Independence Measure (FIM-Motor); self-care self-efficacy; Strategies Used by People to Promote Health; cognition, Mini-Mental State Examination; participant age, sex, type/side of stroke, history of depression (requiring specific management by a healthcare professional), use of antidepressant medications (just before inpatient admission), living arrangements, and availability of an informal carer.

Intervention

Intervention Group

The participants allocated to the intervention group received a multifactorial, integrated approach, which incorporated both standardized and nonstandardized components (see Table 1 and Table I in the online-only Data Supplement). The intervention protocol was auspiced by the research clinician who was a physiotherapist experienced in stroke rehabilitation. The type and intensity of applied interventions were determined on a needs basis (based on arising flags), with the aim to facilitate goal achievement and community reintegration and to address relevant emerging issues.

Control Group

The control group participants received usual care from health and community resources as deemed appropriate by their treating health practitioners.
Sample Size and Statistical Analyses

Poststroke data from an intervention study using the GDS-15 provided the basis for the power calculations in this current study.24 With the criterion for significance set at 0.05 (α, 2-sided), and based on a power of 80%, the target sample size was 55 participants for each arm of the study. This computation assumes that the mean difference between groups is −1.4 (corresponding to means of 2.0 versus 3.4), and the common within-group standard deviation is 2.6 (based on SD estimates of 1.8 and 3.2).

Independent samples t tests and Pearson χ² analyses were used as the statistical methods for baseline comparisons between groups. For the 12-month poststroke data, the primary outcome measure (GDS-15) was analyzed in 2 forms (continuous and categorical). Analysis of the summated GDS-15 scores was conducted with multiple linear regression modeling, controlling for constant independent variables, and the method for reviewing the categorized depression scores was via the use of χ². Exploratory data screening preceded the application of regression analysis, to review whether regression modeling was applicable. Assumption checking was conducted, including examination of the residuals and correlations between variables. On the basis of conceptual and theoretical groundings from reviewing the literature, the constant variables used in this study were as follows: prior history of depression (Prior Dep); FIM (Motor) at rehabilitation admission (FIM Adm); GDS-15 at rehabilitation discharge (GDS Dch); living arrangements at discharge (Living Arr); total length of stay (Total LOS); and study group allocation (Group). The regression analysis derived the coefficient of multiple determination and included standardized and unstandardized β coefficients.

Intention-to-treat analysis was engaged in this study, with the last observation GDS-15 data being carried forward from the 6-month time point to the 12-month time point for participants with missing data (with the exception of deceased participants). The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 19.25

### Results

From the 2 inpatient rehabilitation recruitment sites, 201 patients were admitted with a primary diagnosis of stroke and assessed for eligibility. Of the 138 eligible patients, 110 were randomized into 2 groups (80%), with 54 participants allocated to the intervention group and 56 participants to the control group (see Figure 1).

Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics are outlined in Table 3. Both study groups were comparable on all baseline demographic and clinical parameters. At discharge, all participants were referred for ambulatory or home-based rehabilitation, with 39% of the participants living locally and attending services auspiced by St Vincent’s Hospital and 61% spread across 12 other healthcare regions.

There were no significant differences in the baseline characteristics for those participants who completed the 12 months’ study follow-up (completers, n=94, 85%) compared with the participants for whom 12-month data were unobtainable.

---

**Table 1. Standardized Protocol Components** (Intervention Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Standardized Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At discharge from inpatient rehabilitation</td>
<td>Written information about recovery after stroke, booklet and 7 factsheets&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information about stroke resources, including stroke support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written copy of the devised goals, given to the participant, general medical practitioner, and community-based rehabilitation service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 2 and 6 weeks postdischarge</td>
<td>Telephone contacts†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 3 months postdischarge</td>
<td>Home visit†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 6 months poststroke</td>
<td>Review of outcomes obtained by the blinded assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interventions in response to arising needs flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GDS-15 ≥6 would generate correspondence to GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Failure to resume valued activities or progression toward goals would prompt review of possible barriers to participation and initiation of appropriate strategies (such as liaising with community-based therapists or engaging carers/social networks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 9 months postdischarge</td>
<td>Telephone contact†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 12 months poststroke</td>
<td>Final outcomes obtained by the blinded assessor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GDS-15 indicates Geriatric Depression Scale (15 item); and GP, general practitioner.

<sup>†</sup>The aim of the research clinician’s contacts via telephone and home visits was to gain a general overview of the participants’ progress and to ascertain if any further interventions needed to be initiated. Inquiries were made about how the participant was managing at home; progression with regard to their goals; mood status and presence of concerns; level of informal support available; and episodes of falls or adverse events. Verbal encouragement was given, with specific emphasis on activity level, achievements to date, and efforts toward pursuit of valued goals.

**Table 2. Examples of Nonstandardized Protocol Components** (Intervention Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonstandardized Components</th>
<th>Examples (in Response to Flags)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional telephone contacts with participants (and carers) because of various issues arising or concerns.</td>
<td>Frequency: 97 episodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of low mood status</td>
<td>Requests for further information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication compliance</td>
<td>Request for additional written information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of anxiety</td>
<td>Equipment inquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwards goals</td>
<td>New referrals or rereferrals to services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(noncompleters, n=16), except for the domain of type of stroke ($\chi^2(2)=7.92, P=0.019$) with noncompleters more likely to have had a stroke pathogenesis of cerebral infarction. Of the 16 non-completers, 9 participants were deceased by the 12-month time point. There were no differences in the dropout rates between the groups.

With regard to intention-to-treat analyses, 2 participants died between the 6-month and 12-month time points; thus, their 6-month data were not carried forward. For various reasons (see Figure 1), 5 additional participants had missing data at the 6-month time point. Six-month data for 2 participants were able to be carried forward. Analysis of completor data (n=94) yielded consistent results with analysis of the carried forward data (n=96, addition of 1 participant per study group), and therefore, the carried forward data have been used in the regression model in this study.

Examination of the severity of depressive symptoms (summed GDS-15 scores at 12 months poststroke) was achieved using multiple linear regression analysis. The mean GDS-15 score at 12 months poststroke was 3.6 (SD=2.7) for the intervention group and 4.8 (SD=3.6) for the control group. In the analysis of multicollinearity, all correlations were <0.2 and nonsignificant, apart from a moderate negative correlation between the variables FIM Adm and Total LOS ($r=-0.61; P<0.001$). However, variance inflation factors were low, and this expected association was considered of insufficient strength to warrant the removal of either one of these variables during the analysis.

For the 12-month GDS-15 scores, a significant model occurred using the 6 constant variables, with the analysis explaining 36.6% of the variance ($R^2=0.366; F(6, 89)=8.57; P<0.005$). The significant variables were Prior Dep ($\beta=-0.28; P=0.002$), GDS Dch ($\beta=0.44; P<0.005$), and Group ($\beta=-0.20; P=0.023$). Therefore, after controlling for potentially confounding variables, the intervention group had lower depressive scores at 12 months poststroke compared with the control group. Admission FIM score, living arrangements at rehabilitation discharge, and total length of hospital stay did not present as significant contributors to this model (see Table 4).

There was a significant difference identified between the 2 study groups with respect to the proportions of caseness for depression (GDS-15 ≥6 points) at the 12-month poststroke time point. The proportion of participants with symptoms of depression in the intervention group (n=7, 14.6%) was

Figure 1. Flowchart of participant recruitment. Person responsible required for consent (n=8). FIM-motor indicates 13 motor items of the Functional Independence Measure.
significantly lower than the proportion in the control group \([n=16, 34.8\%]; \chi^2(1)=5.19; P=0.023\).

Overviewing the data, 32 participants (29.1\%) of the whole sample \((n=110)\) had a GDS-15 score \(\geq 6\) at discharge from inpatient rehabilitation. Figure 2 depicts the GDS-15 dichotomized scores and antidepressant medication use. For the intervention group, 18 of 54 participants (33.3\%) had a GDS-15 score \(\geq 6\) at discharge from inpatient rehabilitation. Three of those 18 participants became study noncompleters (ie, they did not have 12-month poststroke GDS-15 data). Of the completers, 7 of the 48 participants (14.6\%) had a GDS-15 score \(\geq 6\) at 12 months poststroke, with 2 participants displaying the emergence of depressed mood during the first year poststroke.

Fourteen of the 56 participants (25.0\%) in the control group had a GDS-15 score \(\geq 6\) at discharge from inpatient rehabilitation. As per the intervention group, 3 of those control group participants became noncompleters of the study. Sixteen of the 46 completers (34.8\%) had a GDS-15 score \(\geq 6\) at 12 months poststroke. Seven participants who rated as depressed at rehabilitation discharge continued to rate as depressed at 12 months poststroke. Nine control group participants, who did not indicate depressive symptoms at inpatient discharge, had depressed mood by 12 months poststroke. Twenty-six participants (27.7\%) were taking antidepressant medications at 12 months poststroke. Seventeen participants (18.1\%) belonged to the control group, and the remaining 9 participants (9.6\%) were in the intervention group (Figure 2). Nine control group participants and 3 intervention group participants commenced antidepressant medication during the study period.

**Discussion**

The aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness on depressive symptoms of a complex rehabilitation intervention that sought to facilitate goal attainment and screen for adverse sequelae during the first 12 months after the event of a stroke. From a review of the published literature, this is one of the first studies to adopt this form of multimodal intervention and to review its effectiveness on the primary outcome of depression. This study demonstrated that the goal-focused intervention resulted in a reduced level of depressive symptoms, as measured by the GDS-15. Of the whole sample in this study, 29.1\% showed evidence of depressed mood at discharge from inpatient rehabilitation. By 12 months poststroke, the participants in the control group had a proportion of depression at
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34.8%, consistent with previously reported estimates,3 whereas the proportion of the intervention group was significantly lower (14.6%).

This indicates that participants who had a history of depression, or were depressed at discharge from inpatient rehabilitation, had a greater likelihood of displaying ongoing depressive symptoms during the first year poststroke. These factors have been identified previously in the literature.26 Level of physical disability (as measured on the Functional Independence Measure-Motor and categorized as severe or moderate/mild) was unrelated to depressive symptoms in this study in contrast to several previous studies.26 Clinicians should be mindful that stroke survivors with mild to moderate physical impairments may also be at risk of developing depressive symptoms.

The use of antidepressant medication in the intervention group was low (9.6%) compared with the rate of use in the control group (18.1%, which was slightly higher than the derived figure of 16.0% previously reported in the literature).27 These results indicated that the difference in the proportion of depressive symptoms between the 2 experimental groups was not specifically because of changes in pharmacological management.

Limitations

There are several issues for consideration during the implementation of this study. The trial was underpowered, with 83% of the proposed recruitment obtained. The difference between the groups (of 1.2) fell short of the hypothesized difference of 1.4 as proposed in the protocol.15 Although statistical significance was achieved, caution is required in interpreting the clinical meaningfulness of the results. The difference is equivalent to one item of the 15-item GDS. In addition, the regression analysis had a low ratio of cases to predictors. The study should ideally be replicated with a larger sample size. A structured interview was not used for the diagnosis of depression (such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition, Text Revision [DSM-IV-TR]).28 For clinical purposes, a valid and easily administered screening tool (GDS-15) was chosen as it could be readily applied in the community setting. Recruitment of the study sample was from only 2 rehabilitation sites; hence, inpatient rehabilitation practice may differ from other rehabilitation centers. However, it should be noted that in this trial, participants received their post-discharge rehabilitation over a range of healthcare services.

Table 4. Summary of the GDS-15 Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>12-month GDS</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE (B)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Dep</td>
<td>−0.38</td>
<td>−2.05</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>−0.28</td>
<td>−3.25</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIM Adm</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td>−0.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>−0.69</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDS Dch</td>
<td>−0.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Arr</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>−0.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>−0.83</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LOS</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>−0.00</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>−1.29</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>−2.31</td>
<td>0.023*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

β indicates standardized beta coefficient; B, unstandardized beta coefficient; FIM Adm, Functional Independence Measure (motor) at rehabilitation admission; GDS Dch, Geriatric Depression Scale (15 item) at rehabilitation discharge; Living Arr, living arrangements at discharge; Prior Dep, prior history of depression; SE, standard error; and Total LOS, total length of stay.

*Significant (variables), P<0.05.

Figure 2. Flowchart of depressive symptoms and antidepressant medication use. AD Meds indicates antidepressant medication; and GDS-15, Geriatric Depression Scale (15 items).
Home visits conducted by the research clinician were only afforded to the intervention participants, with no provision of attention control to both groups. Because of the protocol structure, at times the 3-month postdischarge research clinician home visit and the 6-month poststroke assessor visit were closely aligned because of extended length of inpatient rehabilitation admission. These visits were conducted by separate people at differing times, and the assessor remained blinded to group allocation. This study did not undertake any economic evaluation; therefore, the cost of the intervention has not been determined.

Implications for Clinical Practice
From the results of this study, several key aspects of poststroke management could potentially be incorporated into clinical practice:

1. Collaborative individualized goal setting, with ongoing encouragement to pursue goals and monitoring of barriers to goal achievement
2. Screening at set time points for adverse poststroke sequelae (such as depression, falls, and functional decline), and engagement of appropriate services to address the arising issues
3. Adoption of a self-management approach, aiming to optimize the level of engagement in the ongoing management of one’s own health
4. Promotion of ongoing physical exercise and encouragement to optimize activity and participation levels

Greater awareness of the holistic sequelae that can occur poststroke (including elements such as depressed mood, participation restrictions, and reduced social network engagement) may focus the clinicians’ interventions to achieve outcomes that align themselves more with the patients’ situations, requirements, and their concepts of recovery. The size-fits-all approach is not appropriate, and a multimodal approach should be considered. Additional clinical trials of multifaceted interventions poststroke (with a larger sample across multiple clinics) would offer benefit to determine whether supplementary clinical recommendations can be advocated.

Conclusions
This current study has added to the evidence base for the positive impact of individualized, goal-centered, comprehensive poststroke management for reducing depressive symptoms during the first year poststroke. Aspects of the intervention protocol can be readily incorporated into existing community rehabilitation services.
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The first year after stroke: efficacy of an integrated approach focusing on participation goals for reducing depression.

For this randomized controlled trial, the Intervention group received an integrated approach involving both standardized and non-standardized (responsive) components. The table below (Supplemental Table 1) expands on the intervention overview provided in the main text - by outlining a framework of information provision, line of questioning, and discussion points which served as prompts for further dialogue with the participant.

**Table 1 Intervention Group – standardized components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timepoint</th>
<th>Standardised component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| At discharge from inpatient rehabilitation    | • Written information about recovery after stroke published by the National Stroke Foundation¹:  
  - Booklet: Long term Recovery  
  - Seven factsheets:  
    - Depression after stroke  
    - Movement and exercise after stroke  
    - Medication after stroke  
    - Communication after stroke  
    - Thinking and perception after stroke  
    - Sexuality after stroke  
    - Diet after stroke  
  - Information about stroke and disability resources – including contact details for:  
    - National Stroke Foundation  
    - The Stroke Association of Victoria  
    - Brain Foundation of Victoria  
    - Headway Victoria  
    - Local Municipal Council  
    - Local stroke support group (if available)  
    - Carers Victoria  
  Other contact details given to the participant:  
    - Inpatient Rehabilitation Unit  
    - Research clinician  
  • Written copy of the collaboratively devised goals were given to the participant  
  • Correspondence was sent to the participant’s General Medical Practitioner and main community-based rehabilitation service – which included the participant’s devised goals and information about the trial. |
| At two and six weeks post-discharge            | • Telephone contacts were conducted, and enquires were made about:  
  - Current activity status (example questions, *How are you currently managing being at home? How are you managing with your everyday activities?*)  
  - Current utilisation of post-discharge services, appointments and therapies.  
  - *How are you progressing with your goals?* Identify barriers to goal achievement, and discuss possible strategies to resolve any arising issues. Provide encouragement regarding |
achievements to date, and verbal support to promote goal attainment.

- **Have you had any accidents since you left hospital?** Discuss any injuries sustained from any cause, falls episodes (and near-falls), and any medical issues arising. If incidents did occur, explore nature of the event – including severity, subsequent management, and outcomes.

- **Current coping ability, existing concerns, and overall mood.**
  
  *How are you feeling? Is there anything that is worrying you?* Do you feel that you are coping at the moment? Are there any concerns or needs that you feel are not being currently addressed? Discuss options to utilise relevant supports and services (such as counselling, General Medical Practitioner, and Social Work).

- **Do you have any support from your family / friends / community?** Discuss who provides this informal support (if any) – what are they offering and whether the participant considers that this is sufficient. The level of support afforded to the participant also may have changed over time. *Do you have someone close to you who can provide emotional support?* Discuss relationship issues and any stress, as required.

- **Interest in a Stroke Support Group.** Further assist with contacting the participant’s local support group, as required.

- **Current medication use.** Are you taking medications as prescribed (accurate dosage and timing)? Are you experiencing any side effects? Have you stopped taking any medications? Encourage participant to seek review by Medical Practitioner before altering medications.

- **Is there any further issues or areas that you would like to discuss? Is there anything that you would like more information about?** Reiterate that the participant can contact the research clinician if queries or concerns arise.

From the telephone conversations, determine if there are any indicators for intervention (‘flags’).

| At three months post-discharge | • The research clinician conducted a home visit (face-to-face interview in the participant’s residence). The lines of enquiry at this timepoint followed a similar format to the telephone contacts, however the research clinician was also able to review: how the participant physically moved around their residence; their informal level of self-care and domestic ability; their interactions with carers (if present), and; their non-verbal cues (especially regarding mood status). Verbal encouragement was given, with specific emphasis on highest activity level accomplished, achievements to date and, efforts towards pursuit of valued goals. |
| At six months post-stroke | • The research clinician reviewed the outcome data that were obtained by the blinded assessor. Further interventions were initiated in response to arising needs (See examples of ‘flags’ in Table 2 of the main text, and Supplemental Table II). |
| At nine months post-discharge | • Telephone contact was conducted – with similar enquires to the two week, six week, and three month post-discharge timepoints. Progress towards goals was re-examined. During this contact, the level of ongoing attendance to community rehabilitation services was determined (as many of the therapies had reduced or ceased |
their engagement at this timepoint). Interventions were initiated in response to ‘flags’, as required.

At twelve months post-stroke • Final outcomes obtained by the blinded assessor – no further interventions introduced by the research clinician at this timepoint.

‘Refer also to protocol publication’

The type and intensity of interventions were determined on a ‘needs’ basis (based on arising ‘flags’). In the table below (Supplemental Table 2), three examples of interventions are described to try to highlight possible actions to arising issues. Further guidelines for the responsive interventions are outlined in the study protocol publication.

Table 2 Intervention Group – examples of response to ‘flags’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of ‘Flag’</th>
<th>Example of intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr.X scored 3 points on the GDS-15 at discharge from inpatient rehabilitation, and</td>
<td>- Correspondence to patient’s General Medical Practitioner highlighting the change in GDS-15 scores (perhaps signifying the emerging evidence of depressed mood symptoms), and requesting a review of the participant for assessment and management of their mood status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did not appear to have any evidence of low mood status during the telephone contacts</td>
<td>- Contact from the research clinician – with encouragement to: participate in valued activities (discuss barriers); engage in physical activity (as able), and: enhance social contacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 month home assessment. At 6 months post-stroke the blinded assessor recorded a</td>
<td>GDS-15 score of 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.G had devised a goal regarding attending the local library once a week (via</td>
<td>- Correspondence to relevant therapists at the catchment Community Rehabilitation Centre – re-iterating the participant’s goal, and requesting assistance with pursuing this valued activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public transport) to sit and read his favorite magazine. At the 3 month home</td>
<td>- Verbal encouragement to the participant to: validate his aims; adopt self-management strategies, and; continue to strive towards achieving his aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment, it is apparent that this goal remains relevant to the participant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, pursuit of this goal is not being facilitated during his therapy visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the 3 month post-discharge home assessment, Mrs.K voiced that she is</td>
<td>- The research clinician facilitated a self-review of the current situation. With prompting, Mrs.K decided that she would like to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned about falling whilst walking outdoors – and had therefore essentially</td>
<td>- trial therapy sessions with the focus on outdoor ambulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceased going outside. Before the stroke, Mrs.K used to walk to the café daily to</td>
<td>- explore the option of motorized mobility (such as a scooter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have breakfast and read the newspaper. Therapy input has concluded, and she was</td>
<td>- commence discussions with her friends about how they could perhaps sometimes accompany her during activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currently not receiving any formal services. She was socially isolated – with minimal contact from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>