

1 **Title:** The effect of post-acute rehabilitation setting on 90-day mobility after stroke: A
2 difference-in-difference analysis

3 **Authors:** Margaret A. French, DPT, PhD^{1,2}; Heather Hayes, DPT, PhD¹; Joshua K. Johnson,
4 DPT, PhD³; Daniel L. Young, PT, DPT, PhD⁴; Ryan T. Roemmich, PhD^{2,5}; Preeti Raghavan,
5 MD²

6 ¹ Department of Physical Therapy and Athletic Training, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

7 ² Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine,
8 Baltimore, MD

9 ³ Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH

10 ⁴ Department of Physical Therapy, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV

11 ⁵ Center for Movement Studies, Kennedy Krieger Institute, Baltimore, MD

12 **Short title:** Post-acute setting and mobility after stroke

13 **Twitter names:** @MaggieFrenchDPT, @UofUPT, @RehabPMCOE, @DLYoungDPTPhD,
14 @joshkj_dpt, @RyanRoemmich, @motor_recovery, @RehabHopkins, @HopkinsSKSI

15 **Corresponding author:**

16 Margaret A. French

17 520 Wakara Way

18 Salt Lake City, UT 84108

19 801-581-8681

20 maggie.french@utah.edu

21 **Total word count:** 5938

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** After discharged from the hospital for acute stroke, individuals typically receive
25 rehabilitation in one of three settings: inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs), skilled nursing
26 facilities (SNFs), or home with community services (i.e., home health or outpatient clinics). The
27 initial setting of post-acute care (i.e., discharge location) is related to mortality and hospital
28 readmission; however, the impact of this setting on the change in functional mobility at 90-days
29 after discharge is still poorly understood. The purpose of this work was to examine the impact of
30 discharge location on the change in functional mobility between hospital discharge and 90-days
31 post-discharge.

32 **Methods:** In this retrospective cohort study, we used the electronic health record to identify
33 individuals admitted to Johns Hopkins Medicine with an acute stroke and who had
34 measurements of mobility [Activity Measure for Post Acute Care Basic Mobility (AM-PAC
35 BM)] at discharge from the acute hospital and 90-days post-discharge. Individuals were grouped
36 by discharge location (IRF=190 [40%], SNF=103 [22%], Home with community services=182
37 [(38%)]). We compared the change in mobility from time of discharge to 90-days post-discharge
38 in each group using a difference-in-differences analysis and controlling for demographics,
39 clinical characteristics, and social determinants of health.

40 **Results:** We included 475 individuals (age 64.4 [14.8] years; female: 248 [52.2%]). After
41 adjusting for covariates, individuals who were discharged to an IRF had a significantly greater
42 improvement in AM-PAC BM from time of discharge to 90-days post-discharge compared to
43 individuals discharged to a SNF or home with community services ($\beta=-3.5$ (1.4), $p=0.01$ and $\beta=-$
44 8.2 (1.3), $p<0.001$, respectively).

45 Conclusions: These findings suggest that the initial post-acute rehabilitation setting impacts the
46 magnitude of functional recovery at 90-days after discharge from the acute hospital. These
47 findings support the need for high-intensity rehabilitation and for policies that facilitate the
48 delivery of high-intensity rehabilitation after stroke.

49

50 Key words: stroke, functional recovery, healthcare utilization, post-acute care

51 Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms: IRF- Inpatient rehabilitation facility; SNF- Skilled
52 nursing facility; HH- Home health; OP- Outpatient; AM-PAC BM- Basic Mobility domain of the
53 Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care; ICU- Intensive care unit

54

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Nearly 90% of individuals receive rehabilitation during their initial hospitalization for
58 stroke;^{8,9} however, after discharge from the hospital, participation in post-acute rehabilitation is
59 highly variable¹⁰⁻¹³ despite its positive impact on functional outcomes.¹⁻⁴ This variability starts
60 with the initial post-acute setting in which an individual receives rehabilitation (i.e., discharge
61 location from the hospital), with 20-30% of individuals being discharged to an inpatient
62 rehabilitation facility (IRF),¹⁴⁻¹⁷ 15-25% to a skilled nursing facility (SNF),^{14,16,17} approximately
63 10% home with community services (i.e., home health—HH—or outpatient clinics—OP),^{10,16,17}
64 and 30-40% home without follow up rehabilitation.^{15,16}

65 Each of these potential discharge locations, or post-acute settings, have distinct
66 requirements that impact the frequency, duration, and intensity of rehabilitation that patients
67 receive. For example, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) require IRFs to
68 provide at least 3 hours of therapy, 5 days/week; similarly, CMS and other insurers limit the
69 amount of money spent on rehabilitation or the number of rehabilitation visits an individual can
70 receive per year in outpatient clinics.¹⁸ Due to these requirements and constraints, the frequency,
71 duration, and intensity of care in each of these settings differ, potentially impacting functional
72 outcomes.

73 Previous work comparing outcomes across discharge locations is incomplete as it focuses
74 on non-functional outcomes or functional outcomes at discharge from one or two post-acute care
75 settings (e.g., IRF only^{6,19} or IRF and SNF^{12,20-22}). A majority of prior studies have evaluated
76 non-functional outcomes, such as hospital readmissions or mortality,^{6,12,19-21,23} finding that
77 individuals who are discharged to an IRF have a reduced risk of readmission and mortality
78 compared to individuals discharged to a SNF, although in the short-term IRF care is more

79 expensive.¹⁵ Surprisingly few studies that have examined the impact of discharge location on
80 functional outcomes, which may impact longer-term costs related to disability. The studies that
81 have examined functional outcomes based on discharge location after stroke have focused on
82 function at time of discharge from IRF and SNF by examining the motor domain of the
83 Functional Independence Measure, finding that individuals discharged to IRFs had greater
84 functional gains during the institutional stay.^{24,25} Due to the limitations of previous work, the
85 impact of discharge location on long-term functional outcomes (i.e., 90 days after discharge from
86 the hospital) remains unclear, yet understanding this is essential for identifying the discharge
87 location that provides optimal patient outcomes at the lowest cost (i.e., high-value of care).

88 Thus, the purpose of this work is to examine the impact of discharge location after acute
89 stroke on the change in function between hospital discharge and 90-days post-discharge. Here we
90 will focus on functional mobility as it is commonly impaired after stroke, is a frequent target for
91 rehabilitation, and is associated with other health outcomes.²⁶⁻²⁹ We hypothesized that
92 individuals discharged to an IRF would have a larger improvement in functional mobility (as
93 measured by Basic Mobility domain of the Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care [AM-PAC
94 BM]) from the time of hospital discharge to 90-days post discharge compared to individuals
95 discharged to a SNF or home with community services (i.e., HH or OP). This hypothesis is
96 rooted in knowledge of the frequency, duration, and intensity of rehabilitation in each of these
97 settings, where IRF is delivered at the highest frequency and at the lowest frequency in
98 community settings.

99 **Methods**

100 *Participants*

101 We used data from the electronic health record at Johns Hopkins Medicine in this
102 retrospective cohort study. The Johns Hopkins University’s Institutional Review Board approved
103 the use of these data (IRB00291279). We included individuals over 18 years old who were
104 admitted to either Johns Hopkins Hospital or Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center for an
105 acute stroke as defined by ICD10 codes (Supplemental Methods) between July 1, 2016 and
106 December 31, 2022. Individuals were also required to have a measurement of functional mobility
107 via the AM-PAC BM at two time point (see *Functional Measure*). We excluded individuals who
108 were discharged to a location other than an IRF, SNF, or home with community services to
109 ensure accurate categorization of discharge location. Excluded discharge locations included
110 hospice care, long-term care hospitals, cancer centers, and psychiatric centers. Individuals who
111 were discharged home without rehabilitative services were also excluded.

112

113 *Exposure*

114 The cohort was stratified into three groups based on the discharge location, which was
115 the exposure of interest. These were IRF, SNF, and home with community services (referred to
116 as Home). The Home group included individuals who were discharged home with either HH or
117 OP rehabilitation. For HH and OP, we specifically examined physical therapy services as
118 mobility is a primary focus of this rehabilitation discipline. This information is documented
119 within a discrete field in the electronic health record. Although we do not have direct information
120 about the dosage of therapy received by individuals at these rehabilitative settings, the settings
121 served as a proxy for rehabilitation dosage early after stroke.

122

123 *Functional Measure*

124 We measured mobility with the AM-PAC BM,³⁰ which quantifies function on various
125 mobility tasks (e.g., walking, stair climbing). The AM-PAC BM is routinely collected as part of
126 rehabilitation care at Johns Hopkins Hospital and Bayview Medical Center. On inpatient
127 services, the AM-PAC Inpatient Mobility Short Form (commonly referred to as “6-clicks”) is
128 used, while in OP settings the AM-PAC Community Mobility Short Form is used.³¹ The
129 inpatient and community forms are derived from a shared pool of questions,³¹ making T-scores
130 from these separate administrations directly comparable.³² Thus, T-scores were used in the
131 analysis.

132 We used two AM-PAC BM measurements for all individuals. The first measurement was
133 obtained within 48 hours prior to discharge from the hospital (referred to as the discharge
134 measurement) and the second was obtained 60-90 days after discharge (referred to as the 90-day
135 measurement). If an individual had more than one measurement within these separate time
136 windows, we used the measurement closest to discharge or to 90 days, respectively.

137

138 *Covariates*

139 In addition to the functional measures and discharge destination, we extracted several
140 covariates from the electronic health record. These covariates can broadly be categorized as
141 demographics, clinical information, and social determinants of health and controlled for disease
142 severity, patient prognosis, and for factors impacting discharge location. Demographic
143 information included age at admission for stroke, sex, race, ethnicity, and the presence (or
144 absence) of select comorbidities. The specific comorbidities were diabetes, hypertension,

145 hyperlipidemia, and a history of depression, which were defined using ICD10 codes (see
146 Supplemental Methods).

147 Clinical information included hospital length of stay, type of stroke (i.e., ischemic or
148 hemorrhagic) as determined by ICD10 codes (see Supplemental Methods), stay in an intensive
149 care unit (ICU) during the admission (i.e., yes or no), and previous level of function related to
150 mobility (i.e., independent or not independent). We also included information about the amount
151 of physical therapy during the hospital stay, which we defined as the percentage of days after the
152 physical therapy evaluation that the individuals received physical therapy intervention. We
153 accounted for the involvement of other rehabilitation disciplines (i.e., occupational therapy and
154 speech language pathology) with binary indicators. We also included the first AM-PAC BM
155 score from the admission as a covariate to reflect initial severity of mobility deficits. Similarly,
156 we included the first measurement of the Daily Activity domain of the AM-PAC from the
157 admission to reflect initial severity of deficits related to activities of daily living. This metric is
158 routinely collected as part of clinical care and reflects function on various tasks related to
159 activities of daily living (e.g., donning clothes, bathing).³⁰

160 Lastly, we extracted person- and community-level variables related to social determinants
161 of health. The person-level variables were type of insurance at admission (i.e., Medicare,
162 Medicaid, private, or other) and living situation (i.e., living with or without family). The
163 community-level variables were median household income and the Area Deprivation Index
164 (ADI),^{33,34} which is a composite measure of an area's socioeconomic resources. These metrics
165 were extracted from the American Community Survey and the Neighborhood Atlas,³³
166 respectively, and were linked to each patient using census tract information which was derived
167 from the individual's residential zip code.

168

169 *Statistical Analysis*

170 All analyses were conducted in R (v4.0.5).³⁵ To examine potential sampling bias, we
171 compared all of the covariates in individuals who were included and excluded in the analysis
172 using Wilcoxon rank sum and χ^2 tests for continuous and categorical variables, respectively.
173 Similarly, we compared the three groups of individuals included (i.e., IRF, SNF, Home) on
174 covariates and measures of function using one-way ANOVA and χ^2 tests for continuous and
175 categorical variables, respectively.

176 To evaluate the impact of discharge location on change in functional mobility, we used a
177 difference-in-differences analysis. Difference-in-differences analyses determine the effect of an
178 exposure—in this case initial discharge location—by examining the differences in the outcome
179 between groups before and after the exposure.³⁶⁻³⁸ The model that was used in this analysis was
180 as follows:

$$Y_{it} = B_0 + B_1 Time_t + B_2 SNF_i + B_3 Home_i + B_4 SNF_i Time_t + B_5 Home_i Time_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

181 In this equation, Y_{it} is the AM-PAC BM score at time t for individual i , $Time_t$ is a variable
182 indicating if the measurement was at discharge ($Time_t = 0$) or at 90-days post, and ε_{it}
183 represents covariates. SNF_i and $Home_i$ are variables indicating discharge location of SNF or
184 Home, respectively, resulting in IRF always being coded as 0 and, therefore, serving as the
185 reference group. The coefficient B_0 and B_1 represent the AM-PAC BM score in the reference
186 group at discharge and the change in AM-PAC BM score from discharge to 90-days in the IRF
187 group, respectively; B_2 and B_3 represent the AM-PAC BM score at discharge in the SNF and
188 Home groups, respectively, compared to the IRF group; B_4 and B_5 are the difference-in-

189 differences estimators for the SNF and Home groups, respectively, which represents the change
190 in AM-PAC BM score from discharge to 90-days in SNF and Home, respectively, compared to
191 the IRF group. The visualization of the interpretation of these coefficients are shown in Figure
192 S1 of the Supplemental Methods. We used the lmerTest (v 3.3) package³⁹ to estimate the
193 difference-in-differences models.

194 The inclusion of pre and post measurements in difference-in-differences analyses
195 accounts for baseline differences between groups.^{38,40} However, there is an assumption that the
196 outcome of interest changes similarly over time if the exposure did not occur (i.e., the parallel
197 trend assumption).⁴⁰⁻⁴² When this assumption is not the case, one must control for that variable.
198 Previous research suggests that there are factors that impact an individual's change in function
199 over time, making us skeptical of the parallel trend assumption. In these cases, there are three
200 primary ways to account for these factors: 1) inclusion as covariates that interacts with time,^{40,42}
201 2) propensity score matching,^{40,42-44} and 3) propensity score weighting.^{41,45} We completed the
202 difference-in-differences analysis with and without adjustment. Details about the methods for
203 propensity score matching and weighting are in the Supplemental Methods.

204

205 **Results**

206 *Participants*

207 We included 475 individuals in the final analytic cohort (Figure 1). The primary reason
208 for exclusion of individuals was a lack of AM-PAC BM at 90-days. Compared to individuals
209 who were excluded, those who were included tended to be younger, more likely to be Black, had
210 more comorbidities, and had longer stays during their hospital admission. Importantly, there was

211 no significant difference between individuals included and excluded on their functional status at
212 hospital discharge. (Table S1)

213 *[Insert Figure 1 here]*

214 Of those included, 182 were discharged home with community services, 103 to a SNF,
215 and 190 to an IRF. Individuals discharged to each of these locations differed on several
216 characteristics, including hospital length of stay, initial functional impairment, insurance, and
217 ADI (Table 1). As described above, a difference-in-differences analysis allows for baseline
218 differences between groups as long as those factors do not impact the change over time,^{38,40} and
219 if this is not the case, then they should be included in in the model as done in the current work.

220 *[Insert Table 1 here]*

221

222 *Difference-in-differences Analysis*

223 The results of the difference-in-differences analysis are presented in Table 2. The results
224 are similar regardless of whether or how covariates were included. Thus, in the text we will
225 discuss only the adjusted model. In the adjusted model, the IRF group was estimated to have an
226 AM-PAC BM score at discharge (β_0) of 37.4 (3.0), with a change in AM-PAC BM score from
227 discharge to 90-days (β_1) of 6.3 points (3.3; orange in Figure 2). The SNF group was estimated
228 to have an AM-PAC BM score at discharge that was 2.2 (1.2) points less than the IRF group (β_2)
229 and a change that was 3.5 (1.4) points less than the change in the IRF group (β_4). This is
230 interpreted as the SNF group having a lower initial AM-PAC BM score and a smaller change
231 than the IRF group—even after controlling for covariates (Figure 2—purple). The Home group
232 was estimated to have an AM-PAC BM score at discharge that was 7.5 (1.1) points less than the

233 IRF group (β_3) and a change that was 8.2 (1.3) points less than the IRF group (β_4). This is
234 interpreted as the Home group having a lower AM-PAC BM score at discharge and a smaller
235 change in mobility function than the IRF group after accounting for covariates (Figure 2—
236 green).

237 *[Insert Table 2 here]*

238 *[Insert Figure 2 here]*

239 **Discussion**

240 We examined the impact of discharge location on the change in functional mobility, as
241 measured by the AM-PAC BM, from the time of discharge from the hospital to 90-days after
242 hospital discharge among a cohort of individuals post-stroke. In line with our hypothesis, we
243 found that individuals discharged to an IRF after stroke had a greater improvement in functional
244 mobility than individuals who were discharged to a SNF or home with community services. This
245 was true even after accounting for demographics, clinical information, and social determinants of
246 health using three different statistical approaches. These results add to our current understanding
247 of the impact of discharge location on outcomes by providing insight into the recovery of
248 functional mobility based on discharge location.

249 Our findings may suggest that we should discharge as many patients as possible to an
250 IRF after stroke due to the higher intensity of rehabilitation. However, the level of intensity is not
251 the only difference in the care provided in each post-acute setting. For example, IRFs involve a
252 more comprehensive team than other post-acute settings, which may not be essential for all
253 patients, depending on their health status at the time of discharge from the hospital. This
254 comprehensive team contributes to higher costs of care in IRFs compared to other settings,^{21,24}

255 creating the need to balance the delivery of high-intensity rehabilitation with the cost of care.
256 Thus, we propose that it may be possible for individuals to obtain similar functional
257 improvement by receiving higher intensity care in lower cost settings. Unfortunately, current
258 reimbursement policies limit the ability to provide high intensity rehabilitation in settings outside
259 of IRF (i.e., HH, OP). Future work is needed to explore the cost-effectiveness of care delivery
260 models that provide higher intensity rehabilitation in non-IRF settings. Critically, this work must
261 be designed to shape policy so that insurers cover high intensity rehabilitation in the most
262 appropriate setting for a given individual.

263 In addition to policy that supports the delivery of high intensity rehabilitation, policies
264 must be in place to facilitate the measurement of function after discharge from post-acute
265 settings (IRF, SNF, HH, and OP). Current policies (e.g., the Improving Medicare Post-Acute
266 Care Transformation [IMPACT] Act) have standardized quality measures and outcomes during
267 the rehabilitation episode.⁴⁶ However, information on functional status after discharge from post-
268 acute settings is not required. This is beginning to change with the CMS including 90-day
269 functional status and pain as measures of quality of care in patients with a joint replacement
270 under Bundled Payments for Care Improvement (BPCI) and Comprehensive Care for Joint
271 Replacement Model (CJR models).⁴⁷ Similar policies that make systematic measurement of
272 functional status after stroke are necessary to improve outcomes and the value of care.

273 While our findings suggest that IRFs lead to more improvement in functional outcomes
274 than other post-acute clinical settings (i.e., SNFs and community settings), there is significant
275 variability in the change in functional mobility within each group (Figure 3). The variability
276 supports the need for a shift towards a more individualized understanding of the response to
277 rehabilitation and a more tailored approach to healthcare based on the individual's

278 characteristics.^{48,49} This approach will allow us to better match individuals with the right care in
279 the right setting to improve the value of rehabilitation. Future work to develop individualized
280 predictive models that can help us understand how a specific individual's prognosis would
281 change based on the post-acute rehabilitation setting (or the intensity at which care is provided)
282 is needed to reduce this within-setting variability and improve the efficiency of care delivery.

283 *[Insert Figure 3 here]*

284 *Limitations*

285 This work contributes to our understanding of post-acute rehabilitation setting and
286 functional outcomes after stroke; however, it is not without limitations. First, our sample was
287 limited to those who returned to our healthcare system for care because we used electronic health
288 records from a single healthcare system, resulting in the exclusion of a large number of
289 individuals who did not return to our healthcare system. This likely results in the inclusion of
290 more impaired individuals in our analysis. Although this is a common issue in research using
291 electronic health records, it impacts generalizability. Conducting a similar analysis across
292 healthcare systems would overcome this barrier and improve the generalizability of our findings;
293 however, there are many barriers to sharing data across healthcare systems (e.g., patient privacy,
294 data security, standardized functional data collection), highlighting the need for infrastructure to
295 facilitate data sharing across healthcare systems. Additionally, confounding by indication is a
296 concern with this type of analysis. To minimize the impact of this, we controlled for several
297 covariates with three different statistical approaches. Each of these analytical approaches
298 produced similar results, adding to our confidence in the findings; however, as suggested by
299 Simmonds et al (2023),⁵⁰ a clinical trial to examine the impact of discharge location on
300 functional outcomes after stroke would be valuable. Lastly, our measure of functional mobility

301 was the AM-PAC BM, which is a measure that captures one's perception of difficulty with
302 mobility tasks. While the perception of mobility is an important component of post-stroke
303 recovery, and the AM-PAC BM has good reliability, use of additional measures of functional
304 mobility, such as gait speed and the amount of mobility (e.g., steps per day), would further
305 contribute to our understanding.

306 *Conclusions*

307 These findings improve our understanding of the impact of discharge location on change
308 in function after stroke. We found that individuals discharged to an IRF had greater changes in
309 functional mobility compared to those discharged to a SNF or home with community services.
310 This lays the foundation for future studies that can inform post-stroke rehabilitation and ensure
311 high value care, where we achieve functional improvement in the optimal clinical setting.

312

313 **Acknowledgments:** We would like to acknowledge the Johns Hopkins Precision Rehabilitation
314 Center of Excellence for their assistance in accessing the data for this work and Amit Kumar for
315 his feedback on the manuscript.

316 **Sources of Funding:** This work was funded by the NIH (F32HD108835, K01HS028529) and
317 the Sheikh Khalifa Stroke Institute.

318 **Disclosures:** None.

319 **Supplemental Materials:**

320 Supplemental methods

321 Figure S1

322 Table S1

323

324 **References**

- 325 1. Macko RF, Ivey FM, Forrester LW, Hanley D, Sorkin JD, Katzell LI, Silver KH,
326 Goldberg AP. Treadmill exercise rehabilitation improves ambulatory function and
327 cardiovascular fitness in patients with chronic stroke: a randomized, controlled trial.
328 *Stroke*. 2005;36:2206-2211. doi: 10.1161/01.str.0000181076.91805.89
- 329 2. Pang MY, Charlesworth SA, Lau RW, Chung RC. Using aerobic exercise to improve
330 health outcomes and quality of life in stroke: evidence-based exercise prescription
331 recommendations. *Cerebrovascular diseases (Basel, Switzerland)*. 2013;35:7-22. doi:
332 10.1159/000346075
- 333 3. van de Port IG, Wevers LE, Lindeman E, Kwakkel G. Effects of circuit training as
334 alternative to usual physiotherapy after stroke: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ (Clinical
335 research ed)*. 2012;344:e2672. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e2672
- 336 4. McClellan R, Ada L. A six-week, resource-efficient mobility program after discharge
337 from rehabilitation improves standing in people affected by stroke: Placebo-controlled,
338 randomised trial. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2004;50:163-167. doi:
339 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-9514\(14\)60154-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-9514(14)60154-9)
- 340 5. Paula Caleffi Segura A, Veloso Fontes S, Maiumi Fukujima M, de Andrade Matas SL.
341 The impact evaluation of physical therapy on the quality of life of cerebrovascular stroke
342 patients. *International journal of rehabilitation research Internationale Zeitschrift fur
343 Rehabilitationsforschung Revue internationale de recherches de readaptation*.
344 2006;29:243-246. doi: 10.1097/01.mrr.0000230053.08981.48

- 345 6. Freburger JK, Li D, Fraher EP. Community Use of Physical and Occupational Therapy
346 After Stroke and Risk of Hospital Readmission. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018;99:26-
347 34.e25. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.07.011
- 348 7. Kumar A, Resnik L, Karmarkar A, Freburger J, Adhikari D, Mor V, Gozalo P. Use of
349 Hospital-Based Rehabilitation Services and Hospital Readmission Following Ischemic
350 Stroke in the United States. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.*
351 2019;100:1218-1225. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2018.12.028
- 352 8. Kumar A, Adhikari D, Karmarkar A, Freburger J, Gozalo P, Mor V, Resnik L. Variation
353 in Hospital-Based Rehabilitation Services Among Patients With Ischemic Stroke in the
354 United States. *Physical therapy.* 2019;99:494-506. doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzz014
- 355 9. Reuter B, Gumbinger C, Sauer T, Wiethölter H, Bruder I, Diehm C, Ringleb PA, Hacke
356 W, Hennerici MG, Kern R. Access, timing and frequency of very early stroke
357 rehabilitation - insights from the Baden-Wuerttemberg stroke registry. *BMC Neurol.*
358 2016;16:222. doi: 10.1186/s12883-016-0744-7
- 359 10. Ayala C, Fang J, Luncheon C, King SC, Chang T, Ritchey M, Loustalot F. Use of
360 Outpatient Rehabilitation Among Adult Stroke Survivors - 20 States and the District of
361 Columbia, 2013, and Four States, 2015. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2018;67:575-
362 578. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6720a2
- 363 11. Young BM, Holman EA, Cramer SC. Rehabilitation Therapy Doses Are Low After
364 Stroke and Predicted by Clinical Factors. *Stroke.* 2023;54:831-839. doi:
365 10.1161/strokeaha.122.041098
- 366 12. Bettger JP, Thomas L, Li L. Comparing Recovery Options for Stroke Patients.
367 2019;<https://doi.org/10.25302/3.2019.CER.130>.

- 368 13. Freburger JK, Li D, Johnson AM, Fraher EP. Physical and Occupational Therapy From
369 the Acute to Community Setting After Stroke: Predictors of Use, Continuity of Care, and
370 Timeliness of Care. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2018;99:1077-1089.e1077. doi:
371 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.03.007
- 372 14. Kumar A, Roy I, Bosch PR, Fehnel CR, Garnica N, Cook J, Warren M, Karmarkar AM.
373 Medicare Claim-Based National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale to Predict 30-Day
374 Mortality and Hospital Readmission. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2022;37:2719-2726. doi:
375 10.1007/s11606-021-07162-0
- 376 15. Alcusky M, Ulbricht CM, Lapane KL. Postacute Care Setting, Facility Characteristics,
377 and Poststroke Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2018;99:1124-
378 1140.e1129. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.09.005
- 379 16. Prvu Bettger J, McCoy L, Smith EE, Fonarow GC, Schwamm LH, Peterson ED.
380 Contemporary trends and predictors of postacute service use and routine discharge home
381 after stroke. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2015;4. doi: 10.1161/jaha.114.001038
- 382 17. Freburger JK, Holmes GM, Ku LJ, Cutchin MP, Heatwole-Shank K, Edwards LJ.
383 Disparities in postacute rehabilitation care for stroke: an analysis of the state inpatient
384 databases. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2011;92:1220-1229. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2011.03.019
- 385 18. Services CfMM. Medicare Benefit Policy Manual Chapter 1 (Publication number 100-
386 02). 2021.
- 387 19. Ottenbacher KJ, Graham JE, Ottenbacher AJ, Lee J, Al Snih S, Karmarkar A, Reistetter
388 T, Ostir GV. Hospital readmission in persons with stroke following postacute inpatient
389 rehabilitation. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2012;67:875-881. doi:
390 10.1093/gerona/qlr247

- 391 20. Simmonds KP, Burke J, Kozlowski AJ, Andary M, Luo Z, Reeves MJ. Emulating 3
392 Clinical Trials That Compare Stroke Rehabilitation at Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities
393 With Skilled Nursing Facilities. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2022;103:1311-1319. doi:
394 10.1016/j.apmr.2021.12.029
- 395 21. Buntin MB, Colla CH, Deb P, Sood N, Escarce JJ. Medicare spending and outcomes after
396 postacute care for stroke and hip fracture. *Med Care.* 2010;48:776-784. doi:
397 10.1097/MLR.0b013e3181e359df
- 398 22. Hong I, Goodwin JS, Reistetter TA, Kuo YF, Mallinson T, Karmarkar A, Lin YL,
399 Ottenbacher KJ. Comparison of Functional Status Improvements Among Patients With
400 Stroke Receiving Postacute Care in Inpatient Rehabilitation vs Skilled Nursing Facilities.
401 *JAMA Netw Open.* 2019;2:e1916646. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.16646
- 402 23. Werner RM, Coe NB, Qi M, Konetzka RT. Patient Outcomes After Hospital Discharge to
403 Home With Home Health Care vs to a Skilled Nursing Facility. *JAMA Intern Med.*
404 2019;179:617-623. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.7998
- 405 24. Deutsch A, Granger CV, Heinemann AW, Fiedler RC, DeJong G, Kane RL, Ottenbacher
406 KJ, Naughton JP, Trevisan M. Poststroke rehabilitation: outcomes and reimbursement of
407 inpatient rehabilitation facilities and subacute rehabilitation programs. *Stroke.*
408 2006;37:1477-1482. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.0000221172.99375.5a
- 409 25. Chen CC, Heinemann AW, Granger CV, Linn RT. Functional gains and therapy intensity
410 during subacute rehabilitation: a study of 20 facilities. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*
411 2002;83:1514-1523. doi: 10.1053/apmr.2002.35107
- 412 26. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, Bittencourt MS, Callaway CW, Carson AP,
413 Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, Delling FN, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke

- 414 Statistics-2020 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*.
415 2020;141:e139-e596. doi: 10.1161/cir.0000000000000757
- 416 27. Kramer SF, Hung SH, Brodtmann A. The Impact of Physical Activity Before and After
417 Stroke on Stroke Risk and Recovery: a Narrative Review. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep*.
418 2019;19:28. doi: 10.1007/s11910-019-0949-4
- 419 28. Winovich DT, Longstreth WT, Jr., Arnold AM, Varadhan R, Zeki Al Hazzouri A,
420 Cushman M, Newman AB, Odden MC. Factors Associated With Ischemic Stroke
421 Survival and Recovery in Older Adults. *Stroke*. 2017;48:1818-1826. doi:
422 10.1161/strokeaha.117.016726
- 423 29. Min KB, Min JY. Health-related quality of life is associated with stroke deficits in older
424 adults. *Age Ageing*. 2015;44:700-704. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afv060
- 425 30. Haley SM, Coster WJ, Andres PL, Ludlow LH, Ni P, Bond TL, Sinclair SJ, Jette AM.
426 Activity outcome measurement for postacute care. *Med Care*. 2004;42:I49-61. doi:
427 10.1097/01.mlr.0000103520.43902.6c
- 428 31. Haley SM, Andres PL, Coster WJ, Kosinski M, Ni P, Jette AM. Short-form activity
429 measure for post-acute care. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2004;85:649-660. doi:
430 10.1016/j.apmr.2003.08.098
- 431 32. Haley SM, Coster WJ, Andres PL, Kosinski M, Ni P. Score comparability of short forms
432 and computerized adaptive testing: Simulation study with the activity measure for post-
433 acute care. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2004;85:661-666. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2003.08.097
- 434 33. Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible -
435 The Neighborhood Atlas. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378:2456-2458. doi:
436 10.1056/NEJMp1802313

- 437 34. Singh GK. Area deprivation and widening inequalities in US mortality, 1969-1998. *Am J*
438 *Public Health*. 2003;93:1137-1143. doi: 10.2105/ajph.93.7.1137
- 439 35. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for*
440 *Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria*. 2022.
- 441 36. Abadie A. Semiparametric Difference-in-Differences Estimators. *The Review of*
442 *Economic Studies*. 2005;72:1-19. doi: 10.1111/0034-6527.00321
- 443 37. Lechner M. The Estimation of Causal Effects by Difference-in-Difference Methods.
444 *Foundations and Trends® in Econometrics*. 2011;4:165-224. doi: 10.1561/08000000014
- 445 38. Zhou H, Taber C, Arcona S, Li Y. Difference-in-Differences Method in Comparative
446 Effectiveness Research: Utility with Unbalanced Groups. *Appl Health Econ Health*
447 *Policy*. 2016;14:419-429. doi: 10.1007/s40258-016-0249-y
- 448 39. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear
449 Mixed Effects Models. *2017*. 2017;82:26. doi: 10.18637/jss.v082.i13
- 450 40. Zeldow B, Hatfield LA. Confounding and regression adjustment in difference-in-
451 differences studies. *Health Serv Res*. 2021;56:932-941. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.13666
- 452 41. Stuart EA, Huskamp HA, Duckworth K, Simmons J, Song Z, Chernew M, Barry CL.
453 Using propensity scores in difference-in-differences models to estimate the effects of a
454 policy change. *Health Serv Outcomes Res Methodol*. 2014;14:166-182. doi:
455 10.1007/s10742-014-0123-z
- 456 42. Wing C, Simon K, Bello-Gomez RA. Designing Difference in Difference Studies: Best
457 Practices for Public Health Policy Research. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2018;39:453-469.
458 doi: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-013507

- 459 43. Bryer JM, Speerschneider K. TriMatch: An R Package for Propensity Score Matching of
460 Non-Binary Treatments. Paper/Poster presented 2013;
- 461 44. Rassen JA, Shelat AA, Franklin JM, Glynn RJ, Solomon DH, Schneeweiss S. Matching
462 by propensity score in cohort studies with three treatment groups. *Epidemiology*.
463 2013;24:401-409. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0b013e318289dedf
- 464 45. Thomas LE, Li F, Pencina MJ. Overlap Weighting: A Propensity Score Method That
465 Mimics Attributes of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2020;323:2417-2418. doi:
466 10.1001/jama.2020.7819
- 467 46. United States Department of Health and Human Services. Public Law 113 - 185 -
468 Improving Medicare Post-Acute Care Transformation Act of 2014.
- 469 47. Dummit LA, Kahvecioglu D, Marrufo G, Rajkumar R, Marshall J, Tan E, Press MJ,
470 Flood S, Muldoon LD, Gu Q, et al. Association Between Hospital Participation in a
471 Medicare Bundled Payment Initiative and Payments and Quality Outcomes for Lower
472 Extremity Joint Replacement Episodes. *Jama*. 2016;316:1267-1278. doi:
473 10.1001/jama.2016.12717
- 474 48. French MA, Roemmich RT, Daley K, Beier M, Penttinen S, Raghavan P, Searson P,
475 Wegener S, Celnik P. Precision Rehabilitation: Optimizing Function, Adding Value to
476 Health Care. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2022;103:1233-1239. doi:
477 10.1016/j.apmr.2022.01.154
- 478 49. Parikh RB, Kakad M, Bates DW. Integrating Predictive Analytics Into High-Value Care:
479 The Dawn of Precision Delivery. *Jama*. 2016;315:651-652. doi:
480 10.1001/jama.2015.19417

- 481 50. Simmonds KP, Burke J, Kozlowski AJ, Andary M, Luo Z, Reeves MJ. Rationale for a
482 Clinical Trial That Compares Acute Stroke Rehabilitation at Inpatient Rehabilitation
483 Facilities to Skilled Nursing Facilities: Challenges and Opportunities. *Arch Phys Med
484 Rehabil.* 2022;103:1213-1221. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2021.08.004
- 485 51. Zhao Q-Y, Luo J-C, Su Y, Zhang Y-J, Tu G-W, Luo Z. Propensity score matching with
486 R: conventional methods and new features. *Annals of Translational Medicine.*
487 2021;9:812.
- 488 52. Austin PC. An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the Effects of
489 Confounding in Observational Studies. *Multivariate Behav Res.* 2011;46:399-424. doi:
490 10.1080/00273171.2011.568786
- 491 53. Zhou T, Tong G, Li F, Thomas L. 'PSweight': *Propensity Score Weighting for Causal
492 Inference with Observational Studies and Randomized Trials. Version 1.1.0.* 2020.
- 493 54. Li F, Morgan KL, Zaslavsky AM. Balancing Covariates via Propensity Score Weighting.
494 *Journal of the American Statistical Association.* 2018;113:390-400. doi:
495 10.1080/01621459.2016.1260466
- 496 55. Li F, Thomas LE, Li F. Addressing Extreme Propensity Scores via the Overlap Weights.
497 *Am J Epidemiol.* 2019;188:250-257. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwy201

498

499

Table 1. Characteristics of individuals by discharge location

Variable	IRF* N=190	SNF* N=103	Home with community services* N=182	p-value[†]
Demographic Information				
Age (yrs)	63.9 (15.2)	67.4 (13.7)	63.4 (15.0)	0.08
Sex: Female	91 (47.9)	61 (59.2)	96 (52.7)	0.18
Race				0.24
White	90 (47.4)	55 (53.4)	80 (44.0)	
Black	85 (44.7)	45 (43.7)	93 (51.1)	
Other	15 (7.9)	3 (2.9)	9 (4.9)	
Ethnicity				0.78
Not Hispanic	180 (94.7)	100 (97.1)	174 (95.6)	
Hispanic	7 (3.7)	3 (2.9)	6 (3.3)	
Unknown	3 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.1)	
Diabetes: Present	79 (41.6)	51 (49.5)	80 (44.0)	0.42
Depression: Present	43 (22.6)	32 (31.1)	63 (34.6)	0.03
Hyperlipidemia: Present	116 (61.1)	70 (68.0)	126 (69.2)	0.21
Hypertension: Present	165 (86.8)	96 (93.2)	169 (92.9)	0.08
Clinical Information				
Type of stroke: Ischemic	56 (29.5)	39 (37.9)	47 (25.8)	0.10
Length of Stay (days)	14.3 (17.8)	20.1 (20.9)	8.2 (11.4)	<0.001
Care in the ICU: Present	26 (13.7)	14 (13.6)	24 (13.2)	0.99
Percent days with Physical Therapy	34.9 (25.0)	24.0 (20.4)	42.0 (31.5)	<0.001
Occupational Therapy services utilized: Yes	189 (99.5)	102 (99.0)	162 (89.0)	<0.001
Speech Language Pathology services utilized: Yes	152 (80.0)	70 (68.0)	89 (48.9)	<0.001
Initial AM-PAC Basic Mobility T Score	35.2 (8.4)	33.5 (8.5)	44.6 (9.9)	<0.001
Initial AM-PAC Daily Activity T Score	32.8 (8.0)	32.5 (8.3)	42.2 (9.5)	<0.001

Table 1. Characteristics of individuals by discharge location

Variable	IRF* N=190	SNF* N=103	Home with community services* N=182	p-value [†]
Previous level of function: Independent	141 (74.2)	52 (50.5)	120 (65.9)	<0.001
Social Determinants of Health				
Living situation: Without Family	44 (23.2)	34 (33.0)	48 (26.4)	0.19
Insurance				0.09
Medicare	115 (60.5)	64 (62.1)	98 (53.8)	
Medicaid	21 (11.1)	20 (19.4)	33 (18.1)	
Private	39 (20.5)	14 (13.6)	30 (16.5)	
Other	15 (7.9)	5 (4.9)	21 (11.5)	
Area Deprivation Index (national percentile)	44.9 (26.0)	55.0 (24.9)	52.0 (26.2)	0.002
Median household income (10,000 US dollars)	8.2 (4.1)	6.7 (4.1)	6.8 (3.8)	0.001
Other Information				
AM-PAC Mobility T Score at discharge	39 (7)	35 (9)	50 (9)	<0.001
AM-PAC Mobility T Score at 90-days	47 (14)	37(13)	51 (13)	<0.001

Abbreviations: SNF: Skilled Nursing Facility; IRF: Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility; AM-PAC: Activity Measure of Post Acute Care; ICU: Intensive Care Unit

** Mean (SD); n (%)*

† One-way ANOVA; Pearson's Chi-squared test

500

501

Table 2. Summary of four difference-in-differences models where individuals who were discharge to an inpatient rehabilitation facility (IRF) is the reference.

		Unadjusted (n=475)		Adjusted* (n=475)		Propensity Matched [†] (n=105)		Propensity Weighted [‡] (n=475)	
	Coefficient	Estimate (SE) [§]	P value	Estimate (SE) [§]	P value	Estimate (SE) [§]	P value	Estimate (SE) [§]	P value
n		475		475		105		475	
Intercept	β_0	38.7 (0.8)	<0.001	37.4 (3.0)	<0.001	40.0 (1.9)	<0.001	39.2 (0.8)	<0.001
Time	β_1	8.0 (0.8)	<0.001	6.3 (3.3)	0.05	8.2 (1.6)	<0.001	6.5 (0.8)	<0.001
SNF	β_2	-3.4 (1.3)	0.01	-2.2 (1.2)	0.08	-3.0 (2.7)	0.26	-3.7 (1.3)	0.005
Home	β_3	11.3 (1.1)	<0.001	7.5 (1.1)	<0.001	9.9 (2.7)	<0.001	10.0 (1.2)	<0.001
Post* SNF	β_4	-6.3 (1.4)	<0.001	-3.5 (1.4)	0.01	-3.7 (2.3)	0.11	-3.4 (1.1)	0.002
Post* Home	β_5	-7.3 (1.2)	<0.001	-8.2 (1.3)	<0.001	-12.1 (2.3)	<0.001	-8.2 (1.1)	<0.001


* Age, sex, race, history of diabetes, history of depression, history of hyperlipidemia, history of hypertension, stroke type, length of stay, ICU utilization, previous level of function, initial AM-PAC Basic Mobility and Daily Activity, involvement of occupational therapy and/or speech language pathology, portion of hospital days with physical therapy, living status, insurance type, area deprivation index, and median household income are controlled for in the model.

[†] This model used one-to-one matching on the covariates above, resulting in a reduced sample size.

[‡] In this model, propensity scores were used to weight participants. The above covariates were used to create the propensity score.


[§] Units for these estimates are AM-PAC BM T score points.

502



503


504 **Figure 1.** Consort diagram.



505

506

Figure 2. Results of the adjusted difference-in-difference model. Error bars represent standard error.



507

508 **Figure 3.** Individual discharge and 90-day AM-PAC BM scores by discharge location. Colored lines indicate individual data while

509 black lines show the group averages.