

1 **Title Page**

2

3 **Prediction of Overall Patient Characteristics that Incorporate Multiple Outcomes in**

4 **Acute Stroke: Latent Class Analysis**

5

6 **Short Title:** Prediction of Overall Patient Characteristics

7

8 Junya Uchida, OT^{1,2†}, BS (co-first author); Moeka Yamada OT^{1,3†}, BS (co-first author);

9 Hirofumi Nagayama, OT, PhD^{1*†} (co-first author); Kounosuke Tomori, OT, PhD⁴; Kohei

10 Ikeda, OT, PhD¹; Keita Yamauchi MD, PhD⁵

11

12 ¹Department of Occupational Therapy, Kanagawa University of Human Services,

13 Yokosuka, Japan

14 ²Department of Rehabilitation Therapy, Saiseikai Higashikanagawa Rehabilitation Hospital,

15 Yokohama, Japan

16 ³Department of Occupational Therapy, Shinyokohama Rehabilitation Hospital, Yokohama,

17 Japan

18 ⁴Department of Occupational Therapy, Tokyo University of Technology, Tokyo, Japan

19 ⁵Graduate School of Health Management, Keio University, Fujisawa, Japan

20

21 [†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

22

23 ***Corresponding Author:**

24 Hirofumi Nagayama

25 Department of Occupational Therapy, Kanagawa University of Human Services,

26 1-10-1 Heiseicho, Yokosuka, Kanagawa, 238-8522 Japan

27 Tel: +81-46-828-2724

28 Fax: +81-46-828-2725

29 E-mail: hirofuminagayama@gmail.com

30

31 **Word Count:** 6,015 words

32

33

34

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background:** Previous prediction models have predicted a single outcome (e.g. gait) from
37 several patient characteristics at one point (e.g. on admission). However, in clinical practice,
38 it is important to predict an overall patient characteristic by incorporating multiple outcomes.
39 This study aimed to develop a prediction model of overall patient characteristics in acute
40 stroke patients using latent class analysis.

41 **Methods:** This retrospective observational study analyzed stroke patients admitted to acute
42 care hospitals (37 hospitals, N=10,270) between January 2005 and March 2016 from the
43 Japan Association of Rehabilitation Database. Overall, 6,881 patients were classified into
44 latent classes based on their outcomes. The prediction model was developed based on patient
45 characteristics and functional ability at admission. We selected the following outcome
46 variables at discharge for classification using latent class analysis: Functional Independence
47 Measure (functional abilities and cognitive functions), subscales of the National Institutes of
48 Health Stroke Scale (upper extremity function), length of hospital stay, and discharge
49 destination. The predictor variables were age, Functional Independence Measure (functional
50 abilities and comprehension), subscales of the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale
51 (upper extremity function), stroke type, and amount of rehabilitation (physical, occupational,
52 and speech therapies) per day during hospitalization.

53 **Results:** Patients (N=6,881) were classified into nine classes based on latent class analysis
54 regarding patient characteristics at discharge (class size: 4–29%). Class 1 was the mildest
55 (shorter stay and highest possibility of home discharge), and Class 2 was the most severe
56 (longer stay and the highest possibility of transfers including deaths). Different gradations
57 characterized Classes 3–9; these patient characteristics were clinically acceptable. Predictor

58 variables at admission that predicted class membership were significant (odds ratio: 0.0–
59 107.9, $P < .001$).

60 **Conclusions:** Based on these findings, the model developed in this study could predict an
61 overall patient characteristic combining multiple outcomes, helping determine the appropriate
62 rehabilitation intensity. In actual clinical practice, internal and external validation is required.

63

64

65 **Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms**

66 ADLs; activities of daily living

67 LCA; latent class analysis

68 FIM; Functional Independence Measure

69 NIHSS; National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale

70 **Introduction**

71 Annually, 15 million people worldwide suffer from stroke, resulting in five million deaths
72 and five million developing stroke-related disabilities.¹⁾ Rehabilitation services are included
73 as the indispensable mechanism that encourages functional recovery and independence in
74 acute stroke patients.²⁾ A formal assessment of activities of daily living (ADLs), instrumental
75 ADLs, communication abilities, and functional mobility is recommended for the
76 rehabilitation of stroke patients before discharge. The findings should be incorporated into the
77 care transition and discharge planning process.^{2, 3)} In addition, when considering a discharge
78 destination from the acute setting, clinicians consider a patient's prognosis of functional
79 recovery as the most critical factor.^{4, 5)} Therefore, predicting a patient's condition at discharge
80 based on the assessment results at admission can provide a valuable contribution to
81 personalized rehabilitation plans.

82 A recent review⁶⁾ reported that several tools had been developed to predict the outcomes for
83 independence,⁷⁻⁹⁾ upper extremity function,^{10, 11)} gait,¹²⁻¹⁷⁾ and swallowing.^{18, 19)} These
84 previous studies have predicted a single outcome based on multiple variables. However, from
85 a clinical perspective, it is crucial to predict overall patient characteristics, incorporating
86 multiple outcomes at discharge, not just a single outcome. Overall patient characteristics
87 might be, for example, a patient is expected to be able to walk independently but may need
88 assistance with communication and cognitive function. Despite the importance of predicting
89 overall patient characteristics, previous studies have not developed such a comprehensive
90 prediction model, leaving the problem unresolved. Therefore, developing a prediction model
91 of overall patient characteristics at discharge in acute stroke patients will provide a new
92 solution to a problem previous prediction models have not solved.

93 We employed latent class analysis (LCA) to solve these problems. LCA is a subset of
94 structural equation modeling that categorizes heterogeneous classes (segments) from the
95 study population by associating manifest variables with notions (latent variables) that cannot
96 be directly measured.²⁰⁾ LCA is useful when differences in the underlying distributions
97 among variables contribute to heterogeneity within a study population.²¹⁾ Using LCA, it is
98 possible to identify classes of overall patient characteristics (such as discharge destination,
99 physical function, functional abilities, and length of stay) at discharge and to develop a model
100 that predicts which class the patient belongs based on their characteristics at admission.
101 Therefore, this study aimed to develop a prediction model of overall patient characteristics in
102 acute stroke patients using LCA. This prediction model has the potential to predict
103 conventional functional status and determine appropriate rehabilitation intensity levels
104 (amount of rehabilitation per day) for individual patients.

105

106 **Methods**

107 We conducted a retrospective observational study using the Japan Association of
108 Rehabilitation Database.^{22, 23)} The need for informed consent was waived because all data
109 were de-identified. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Kanagawa
110 University of Human Services (No. 7-20-30).

111

112 ***Database***

113 Data from the Japan Association of Rehabilitation Database, voluntarily sampled from
114 patients admitted to participating hospitals between January 2005 and March 2016,²²⁻²⁴⁾ were
115 obtained retrospectively. The data were separated into different categories based on the
116 diagnosis and stage, such as stroke in the medical ward, stroke in the convalescent

117 rehabilitation ward, and other conditions. The National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale
118 (NIHSS) and Functional Independence Measure (FIM) scores, patient age, stroke type,
119 severity, rehabilitation type, and rehabilitation length are all recorded in the stroke database.
120 Data from 33,657 patients were collected in 2016, when 80 hospitals participated in the study.
121 All data gathered on stroke patients admitted to acute care hospitals (37 hospitals, N=10,270)
122 between the time of admission and discharge were used in this study.

123

124 ***Participants***

125 *Inclusion Criteria*

126 The inclusion criteria of this study were (1) patients with acute stroke admitted to registered
127 hospitals in the Japan Association of Rehabilitation Database between 2005 and 2015, (2)
128 those who were aged ≥ 18 years, and (3) those provided with rehabilitation (physical,
129 occupational, and speech therapy).

130 *Exclusion Criteria*

131 The exclusion criteria were (1) no data on age at admission, (2) no data on the discharge
132 destination, (3) age < 18 years, (4) no rehabilitation provided during hospitalization, (5)
133 duration from stroke onset to admission of > 7 days, (6) rehabilitation for > 9 units (180 min) a
134 day during hospitalization, because, in the Japanese rehabilitation system, there is a limit of 9
135 units daily for rehabilitation. Therefore, assuming that a patient receiving > 9 units a day is
136 undergoing a normal rehabilitation program is difficult. (7) length of stay of < 1 day or > 179
137 days, (8) no data on all of the items of the FIM and NIHSS at admission and/or discharge,
138 and (9) no data on all of the items of the FIM both at admission and discharge.

139

140 ***Outcome Variables at Discharge***

141 Based on previous studies and clinical perspectives, we selected the following outcome
142 variables at discharge for classification using LCA: functional abilities, cognitive functions,
143 upper extremity function, length of hospital stay, and discharge destination.

144 The FIM assessed functional abilities at discharge. The FIM includes 18 items to determine
145 the amount of assistance for a person with a disability to perform daily activities safely and
146 effectively.²⁵⁾ All items were scored using a 7-point scale: 1, total assistance; 2, maximum
147 assistance; 3, moderate assistance; 4, minimal assistance; 5, supervision; 6, modified
148 independence; and 7, complete independence. Based on previous studies,^{26, 27)} we classified
149 these seven scales into three groups: complete dependence (1–2), modified dependence (3–5),
150 and independence (6–7). Outcome variables extracted as functional abilities were eating,
151 transfer (bed/chair/wheelchair), toileting, locomotion (walk/wheelchair), and transfer
152 (shower/bathtub).

153 Cognitive functions were also described referring to the cognitive subscale of the FIM. Three
154 items of the FIM cognitive subscale were extracted: comprehension, expression, and social
155 interaction. Social interaction was identified as a significant predictor of the post-
156 rehabilitation destinations in acute stroke patients.²⁸⁾ Patients with deficits in comprehension
157 could constitute serious problems in their homes despite the support of their families because
158 they might not be able to understand the provided information.²⁹⁾

159 The upper extremity function was collected from the score on the motor arm, one of the
160 NIHSS subscales. The NIHSS is a scale highly widely used in modern neurology that rates
161 deficits.³⁰⁾ The score of the motor arm is from 0 to 4. A high score on this item indicates
162 severe impairment in the patient's upper extremities.

163 Length of hospital stay varies from patient to patient, depending on the stroke's severity, the
164 patient's background influencing their discharge destination, and other factors. Therefore, it

165 was classified into the following four categories: 1–14 days, 15–28 days, 29–42 days, and
166 ≥ 43 days.

167 Discharge destinations confirmed in the dataset were grouped into five groups: home,
168 different hospitals, facilities, death, and others.

169

170 *Predictor Variables*

171 In this study, the predictor variables were the patient characteristics and functional ability at
172 admission, expected to contribute to classification at discharge from previous studies and
173 clinical perspectives. They include age, functional abilities, comprehension, upper extremity
174 function, type of stroke, and the daily amount of rehabilitation (physical, occupational, and
175 speech therapies) during hospitalization.

176 We have included the following functional outcomes in FIM items: eating,^{28, 31)} locomotion
177 (walk/wheelchair),³²⁾ and comprehension.^{29, 33)} Stroke patients had a higher possibility of
178 being discharged home if admitted with a higher motor FIM score and a lower chance of
179 being discharged home if they were older or had a cognitive defect.³⁴⁾ FIM toileting was one
180 of the initial items that predicted disposition in acute stroke patients.³¹⁾ Based on the motor
181 FIM score at admission, there was a correlation between locomotion gain and other self-care
182 in stroke patients. A variation in locomotion gain influenced the improvement in self-care.³²⁾
183 In addition, aphasia was identified as a strong prognostic factor in post-stroke outcomes.³³⁾
184 Furthermore, deficits in auditory comprehension, reading comprehension, and oral spelling to
185 dictation were associated with a higher possibility of discharge to a setting other than
186 home.²⁹⁾

187 The use of the NIHSS score as an early predictor of outcome following acute hospitalization
188 for stroke has received support.³⁵⁾ The NIHSS score of the affected upper extremity assessed

189 at admission was associated with long-term functional outcomes evaluated using the FIM in
190 patients with middle cerebral artery infarction.³⁶⁾

191 The types of stroke confirmed in the dataset were grouped into the following eight categories:
192 lacunar infarction, atherothrombotic cerebral infarction, cardiogenic embolism, cerebral
193 infarction (others/unknown), hypertensive cerebral hemorrhage, cerebral hemorrhage
194 (others/unknown), subarachnoid hemorrhage, and others/unknown.

195 Regarding the amount of daily rehabilitation, following Japanese health insurance guidelines,
196 20-minute rehabilitation (physical, occupational, and speech therapies) is defined as 1 unit.
197 This study categorized the amount of daily rehabilitation provided for each patient available
198 on the dataset into four groups: <2 units (<40 min), ≥ 2 –<4 units (40–80 min), ≥ 4 –<6 units
199 (80–120 min), and ≥ 6 units (>120 min).

200

201 *Statistical Analyses*

202 We used the two-step method proposed by Bakk and Kuha³⁷⁾ in developing a prediction
203 model of LCA for the patient characteristics at discharge. When developing a prediction
204 model, this method has less bias than other methods and is recommended even when missing
205 values exist.³⁸⁻⁴⁰⁾ The two-step method comprises the following steps: 1) to fit the latent class
206 measurement model on its own and 2) to maximize the joint likelihood with the measurement
207 model's parameters and exogenous latent variables' parameters fixed at the first step's
208 estimated values, allowing only the structural model's remaining parameters to be estimated
209 in the second step.³⁷⁾

210 In the first step, we conducted an LCA with our selected outcome variables to identify the
211 patient's condition at discharge. The optimal latent model for the number of latent classes was
212 determined using a combination of Bayesian information criterion (BIC), entropy, Vuong-Lo-

213 Mendell-Rubin, and class size.^{41, 42)} For the second step, we estimated a prediction model for
214 the calculated classes in the first step with our selected predictor variables of the patient
215 condition at admission. In addition, we processed missing data by employing full information
216 maximum likelihood default in Latent GOLD®6.0.^{43, 44)} We used the Latent GOLD®6.0
217 (Statistical Innovations, Arlington, MA, USA) for LCA and the calculation of prediction
218 models. The significance level was set at $P < .05$.

219

220 **Results**

221 *Patient Characteristics*

222 After applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria in this study, 6,881 patients were included
223 (Figure 1), and baseline characteristics at admission and discharge are summarized in Table 1.
224 The mean age at admission was 73.7 years, and the average length of stay was 29.5 days. The
225 total FIM scores, scores of all FIM subitems, and scores of the NIHSS improved at discharge
226 from admission.

227

228 *Latent Classes of Patient Characteristics at Discharge*

229 Overall, 6,881 patients were classified into latent classes using LCA based on their outcomes.
230 Latent class models with 1–12 classes were examined to select the best latent class. Model-fit
231 statistics for LCA models with 1–12 classes are shown in Table 2. The difference in BIC/AIC
232 fit between the models showed that it began to decline in the nine-class model. The smallest
233 class size was <5% after the nine-class model.

234 In determining the number of classes, one occupational therapist and two occupational
235 therapy students selected the nine-class model for this study, based on the interpretability of
236 the class characteristics, given that a minimum class size of at least 5% is recommended.⁴²⁾
237 Table 3 shows the class sizes and item response probabilities for the outcomes at discharge
238 within each class. For example, a class size of 29% for Class 1 indicates that 29% of all
239 patients belong to this class and that 97% of the patients within Class 1 would return home as
240 “Discharge destination.” The overall characteristics of each class indicated that Class 1 was
241 the mildest (shorter length of stay and the highest possibility of home discharge), and Class 2
242 was the most severe (longer length of stay and the highest possibility of transfers, including
243 deaths). Different gradations characterized classes 3–9; these patient characteristics were
244 clinically acceptable.

245

246 *Predictors of Class Membership*

247 All predictors of patient characteristics at admission were significant enough to predict
248 outcomes at discharge ($P < .01$), and the standard R-squared, which indicates the goodness-of-
249 fit of the prediction model, was 0.3383 (Table S1, S2). Relatively stronger predictors
250 relative to Class 1 (maximum odds ratio was >10.0 in a single predictor) were the right/left
251 motor arm of the NIHSS score. In particular, Class 8 showed extremely high odds of
252 belonging if the left motor arm of the NIHSS score was 4. Additionally, Class 9 also showed
253 particularly high odds if the right motor arm of the NIHSS score was 4. Furthermore,
254 regarding the amount of daily rehabilitation, the odds ratio tended to decrease in the severe
255 class and increase in the mild class as the amount of rehabilitation increased. However, this
256 was not always the case.

257

258 ***Model Application***

259 Our prediction model can predict the overall patient characteristics of acute stroke patients at
260 discharge (Video S1). The predicted results can allow practitioners to provide appropriate
261 interventions that maximize effectiveness. Our made-up example for the model application is
262 a patient aged 85 with a cardiogenic embolism and a severe disability on the right side of the
263 body. The patient is provided 4–6 units (80–120 min) of rehabilitation daily and requires
264 modified to complete assistance with ADLs. According to the predicted probability, the
265 patient has the highest possibility of transfer and right moderate upper extremity disability at
266 discharge. The patient is predicted to require modified to complete assistance with ADLs and
267 complete assistance with communication and social interaction.

268

269 **Discussion**

270 This study used LCA to classify acute stroke patients based on the overall patient condition at
271 discharge. We also developed a model to predict their class based on patient characteristics at
272 admission. The results showed that overall patient conditions at discharge were classified into
273 nine classes, and all the selected predictors at admission were significantly associated with
274 class memberships. This model was innovative in predicting the overall patient outcomes,
275 which previous models have been unable to resolve, including the appropriate rehabilitation
276 intensity and length of stay.

277 As for the predictors of this study, age, functional abilities, comprehension, upper extremity
278 function, stroke type, and amount of rehabilitation (physical, occupational, and speech
279 therapies) per day during hospitalization were significantly associated with class membership
280 at discharge. These results were similar to those of previous studies.^{33, 34, 36, 45)}

281 There are two points of particular note in this study's findings. The first point was that the
282 severity of the left and right upper extremities paralysis at admission had different patient
283 characteristics at discharge. This study showed that Classes 6 and 8 were characterized as
284 severe to moderate paralysis of the left upper extremity at discharge. Communication in these
285 classes ranged from independence to modified dependence, although ADLs such as self-care
286 were modified to complete dependence. These may be due to the influence of unilateral
287 spatial neglect, which may be a factor causing the need for assistance with ADLs.^{46, 47)} In
288 addition, Class 9 was characterized as severe to moderate paralysis of the right upper
289 extremity at the discharge. In this class, communication was complete dependence, and ADLs
290 such as self-care ranged from modified to complete dependence. These may be due to the
291 influence of aphasia, which may cause difficulties with communication.⁴⁸⁾ These results were
292 clinically convincing, and appropriate rehabilitation could be provided by addressing these
293 factors from the early stages of admission.

294 The second point was the intensity of rehabilitation. In some classes, a higher intensity of
295 rehabilitation did not necessarily lead to better outcomes. It is necessary to reconsider the
296 currently accepted philosophy "more practice is always better," particularly in the first days
297 after a stroke.⁴⁹⁾ The model developed in this study also improves the calculation of how the
298 overall outcome at discharge is affected by the intensity of provided rehabilitation. Therefore,
299 by using the model of this study, providing individualized rehabilitation with its intensity
300 optimized for the patient's characteristics is possible.

301

302 *Limitations*

303 There were some limitations in this study. First, we did not conduct internal and external
304 validation. A prediction model should be validated using original data to examine internal

305 validity through methods such as resampling (e.g., cross-validation and bootstrapping) and
306 using other participants' data from the same or different institutions or periods to improve the
307 model's validity (external validation).⁵⁰⁾ Therefore, before applying this prediction model to
308 actual clinical practice, validation of this prediction model needs to be performed. Second,
309 the dataset we referred to did not contain enough details about interventions provided for
310 participants. Hence, the difference in interventions among participants might have influenced
311 the LCA and prediction model results.

312 Third, other potential predictors that significantly influence the outcomes at discharge can be
313 available at admission. However, in this study, we selected predictor variables according to
314 the findings of as many previous studies as possible and our clinical viewpoint. Therefore, we
315 consider the model the most applicable presently. The model will be more accurate if these
316 issues are addressed in future validation studies.

317

318 **Conclusion**

319 In conclusion, we developed a prediction model of overall patient conditions, including the
320 appropriate rehabilitation intensity in acute stroke patients using LCA. Before applying this
321 model to actual clinical practice, internal and external validation would be required to
322 improve its validity. Further studies could shed light on the potential influence of the
323 predictors and the appropriate amount of rehabilitation for stroke patients, depending on their
324 medical characteristics and severity.

325

326 **Acknowledgments**

327 We thank the rehabilitation patient database developed by the Japan Association of
328 Rehabilitation Database for providing the data for this study. This study's results and

329 conclusions are the authors' views, not the official views of the Japanese Association of
330 Rehabilitation Medicine. We also appreciate the participants, their families, and the
331 associations involved in this study.

332

333 **Funding/Support**

334 This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant number: JP20H03914).

335

336 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures**

337 The authors declare that the research was conducted without any commercial or financial
338 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

339

340 **Supplemental Material**

341 Tables S1. Model fit of the prediction model

342 Table S2. Odds ratios (ORs) and p-values from the multivariate prediction of class
343 membership (n=6,881)

344 Movie S1. Model application

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352 **References**

- 353 1. World Health Organization. Stroke, Cerebrovascular accident. @whoemro.
354 <http://www.emro.who.int/health-topics/stroke-cerebrovascular-accident/index.html>.
355 Published 2023. Accessed 2/9, 2023.
- 356 2. Winstein CJ, Stein J, Arena R, Bates B, Cherney LR, Cramer SC, Deruyter F, Eng JJ,
357 Fisher B, Harvey RL, et al. Guidelines for Adult Stroke Rehabilitation and Recovery:
358 A Guideline for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart
359 Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. 2016;47:e98–e169.
- 360 3. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K,
361 Biller J, Brown M, Demaerschalk BM, Hoh B, et al. Guidelines for the Early
362 Management of Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke: 2019 Update to the 2018
363 Guidelines for the Early Management of Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Guideline for
364 Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke
365 Association. *Stroke*. 2019;50:e344–e418.
- 366 4. Cormier DJ, Frantz MA, Rand E, Stein J. Psychiatrist referral preferences for
367 postacute stroke rehabilitation. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016;95:e4356.
- 368 5. Kennedy GM, Brock KA, Lunt AW, Black SJ. Factors influencing selection for
369 rehabilitation after stroke: A questionnaire using case scenarios to investigate
370 physician perspectives and level of agreement. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*.
371 2012;93:1457–1459.
- 372 6. Stinear CM, Smith M-C, Byblow WD. Prediction tools for stroke rehabilitation.
373 *Stroke*. 2019;50:3314–3322.

- 374 7. de Ridder IR, Dijkland SA, Scheele M, den Hertog HM, Dirks M, Westendorp WF,
375 Nederkoorn PJ, van de Beek D, Ribbers GM, Steyerberg EW, et al. Development and
376 validation of the Dutch Stroke Score for predicting disability and functional outcome
377 after ischemic stroke: A tool to support efficient discharge planning. *Eur Stroke J*.
378 2018;3:165–173.
- 379 8. Douiri A, Grace J, Sarker SJ, Tilling K, McKeivitt C, Wolfe CD, Rudd AG. Patient-
380 specific prediction of functional recovery after stroke. *Int J Stroke*. 2017;12:539–548.
- 381 9. Scrutinio D, Lanzillo B, Guida P, Mastropasqua F, Monitillo V, Pusineri M, Formica
382 R, Russo G, Guarnaschelli C, Ferretti C, et al. Development and validation of a
383 predictive model for functional outcome after stroke rehabilitation: The Maugeri
384 model. *Stroke*. 2017;48:3308–3315.
- 385 10. Nijland RH, van Wegen EE, Harmeling-van der Wel BC, Kwakkel G, Investigators E.
386 Presence of finger extension and shoulder abduction within 72 hours after stroke
387 predicts functional recovery: early prediction of functional outcome after stroke: The
388 EPOS cohort study. *Stroke*. 2010;41:745–750.
- 389 11. Stinear CM, Byblow WD, Ackerley SJ, Smith MC, Borges VM, Barber PA. PREP2:
390 A biomarker-based algorithm for predicting upper limb function after stroke. *Ann*
391 *Clin Transl Neurol*. 2017;4:811–820.
- 392 12. Bland MD, Sturmoski A, Whitson M, Connor LT, Fucetola R, Huskey T, Corbetta M,
393 Lang CE. Prediction of discharge walking ability from initial assessment in a stroke
394 inpatient rehabilitation facility population. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2012;93:1441–
395 1447.

- 396 13. Kinoshita S, Abo M, Okamoto T, Tanaka N. Utility of the revised version of the
397 ability for basic movement scale in predicting ambulation during rehabilitation in
398 poststroke patients. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.* 2017;26:1663–1669.
- 399 14. Kwah LK, Harvey LA, Diong J, Herbert RD. Models containing age and NIHSS
400 predict recovery of ambulation and upper limb function six months after stroke: An
401 observational study. *J Physiother.* 2013;59:189–197.
- 402 15. Sánchez-Blanco I, Ochoa-Sangrador C, López-Munaín L, Izquierdo-Sánchez M,
403 Fermoso-Garcia J. Predictive model of functional independence in stroke patients
404 admitted to a rehabilitation programme. *Clin Rehabil.* 1999;13:464–475.
- 405 16. Smith M-C, Barber PA, Stinear CM. The TWIST algorithm predicts time to walking
406 independently after stroke. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2017;31:955–964.
- 407 17. Veerbeek JM, Van Wegen EE, Harmeling-Van der Wel BC, Kwakkel G, Investigators
408 E. Is accurate prediction of gait in nonambulatory stroke patients possible within 72
409 hours poststroke? The EPOS study. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2011;25:268–274.
- 410 18. Faigle R, Marsh EB, Llinas RH, Urrutia VC, Gottesman RF. Novel score predicting
411 gastrostomy tube placement in intracerebral hemorrhage. *Stroke.* 2015;46:31–36.
- 412 19. Galovic M, Stauber AJ, Leisi N, Krammer W, Brugger F, Vehoff J, Balcerak P,
413 Muller A, Muller M, Rosenfeld J, et al. Development and validation of a prognostic
414 model of swallowing recovery and enteral tube feeding after ischemic stroke. *JAMA*
415 *Neurology.* 2019;76:561–570.
- 416 20. Formann AK, Kohlmann T. Latent class analysis in medical research. *Stat Methods*
417 *Med Res.* 1996;5:179–211.

- 418 21. Kongsted A, Nielsen AM. Latent class analysis in health research. *J Physiother.*
419 2017;63:55–58.
- 420 22. Kinoshita S, Kakuda W, Momosaki R, Yamada N, Sugawara H, Watanabe S, Abo M.
421 Clinical management provided by board-certificated physiatrists in early
422 rehabilitation is a significant determinant of functional improvement in acute stroke
423 patients: A retrospective analysis of Japan rehabilitation database. *J Stroke*
424 *Cerebrovasc Dis.* 2015;24:1019–1024.
- 425 23. Jeong S, Kondo K, Shiraishi N, Inoue Y. An evaluation of the quality of post-stroke
426 rehabilitation in Japan. *Clinical Audit.* 2010;2:59–66.
- 427 24. Kamo T, Momosaki R, Suzuki K, Asahi R, Azami M, Ogihara H, Nishida Y.
428 Effectiveness of intensive rehabilitation therapy on functional outcomes after stroke:
429 A propensity score analysis based on Japan Rehabilitation Database. *J Stroke*
430 *Cerebrovasc Dis.* 2019;28:2537–2542.
- 431 25. Ottenbacher KJ, Hsu Y, Granger CV, Fiedler RC. The reliability of the functional
432 independence measure: A quantitative review. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*
433 1996;77:1226–1232.
- 434 26. Furuta H, Mizuno K, Unai K, Ebata H, Yamauchi K, Watanabe M. Functional
435 Independence Measure subtypes among inpatients with subacute stroke:
436 Classification via latent class analysis. *Prog Rehabil Med.* 2022;7:20220021.
- 437 27. Pedersen AR, Severinsen K, Nielsen JF. The effect of age on rehabilitation outcome
438 after traumatic brain injury assessed by the Functional Independence Measure (FIM).
439 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2014;29:299–307.

- 440 28. Aoki K, Iguchi A, Watabe T. Evaluation of Functional Independence Measure item
441 scores for predicting home discharge after acute stroke rehabilitation. *Japanese*
442 *Journal of Comprehensive Rehabilitation Science*. 2020;11:17–20.
- 443 29. González-Fernández M, Christian AB, Davis C, Hillis AE. Role of aphasia in
444 discharge location after stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2013;94:851–855.
- 445 30. Lyden P. Using the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale. *Stroke*. 2017;48:513–
446 519.
- 447 31. Mauthe RW, Haaf DC, Haya P, Krall JM. Predicting discharge destination of stroke
448 patients using a mathematical model based on six items from the functional
449 independence measure. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1996;77:10–13.
- 450 32. Kimura T. Interaction between locomotion and self-care for patients with stroke in
451 severity classification based on the motor Functional Independence Measure upon
452 admission to the recovery ward. *Open J Ther Rehabil*. 2020;08:164–182.
- 453 33. Gialanella B, Bertolinelli M, Lissi M, Prometti P. Predicting outcome after stroke:
454 The role of aphasia. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2011;33:122–129.
- 455 34. Nguyen VQ, PrvuBettger J, Guerrier T, Hirsch MA, Thomas JG, Pugh TM, Rhoads
456 CF 3rd. Factors associated with discharge to home versus discharge to institutional
457 care after inpatient stroke rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2015;96:1297–
458 1303.
- 459 35. Schlegel D, Kolb SJ, Luciano JM, Tovar JM, Cucchiara BL, Liebeskind DS, Kasner
460 SE. Utility of the NIH Stroke Scale as a predictor of hospital disposition. *Stroke*.
461 2003;34:134–137.

- 462 36. Saito J, Koyama T, Domen K. Long-term outcomes of FIM motor items predicted
463 from acute stage NIHSS of patients with middle cerebral artery infarct. *Ann Rehabil*
464 *Med.* 2018;42:670–681.
- 465 37. Bakk Z, Kuha J. Two-step estimation of models between latent classes and external
466 variables. *Psychometrika.* 2018;83:871–892.
- 467 38. Vermunt JK, Magidson J. How to perform three-step latent class analysis in the
468 presence of measurement non-invariance or differential item functioning. *Struct Equ*
469 *Modeling.* 2020;28:356–364.
- 470 39. Alagöz ÖEC, Vermunt JK. Stepwise latent class analysis in the presence of missing
471 values on the class indicators. *Struct Equ Modeling.* 2022;29:784–790.
- 472 40. Janssen JHM, van Laar S, de Rooij MJ, Kuha J, Bakk Z. The detection and modeling
473 of direct effects in latent class analysis. *Struct Equ Modeling.* 2018;26:280–290.
- 474 41. Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Deciding on the number of classes in latent
475 class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Struct*
476 *Equ Modeling.* 2007;14:535–569.
- 477 42. Weller BE, Bowen NK, Faubert SJ. Latent class analysis: A guide to best practice. *J*
478 *Black Psychol.* 2020;46:287–311.
- 479 43. Edwards SL, Berzofsky ME, Biemer PP. RTI Press Methods Report Series. In:
480 *Addressing Nonresponse for Categorical Data Items Using Full Information*
481 *Maximum Likelihood with Latent GOLD 5.0.* Research Triangle Park (NC): RTI
482 Press © 2018 Research Triangle Institute. All rights reserved.; 2018.
- 483 44. Vermunt JK, Magidson J. *Upgrade Manual for Latent GOLD Basic, Advanced,*
484 *Syntax, and Choice Version 6.0.* Arlington. MA: Statistical Innovations Inc.; 2021.

- 485 45. Wee JY, Hopman WM. Stroke impairment predictors of discharge function, length of
486 stay, and discharge destination in stroke rehabilitation. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.*
487 2005;84:604–612.
- 488 46. Doron N, Rand D. Is unilateral spatial neglect associated with motor recovery of the
489 affected upper extremity poststroke? A systematic review. *Neurorehabil Neural*
490 *Repair.* 2019;33:179–187.
- 491 47. Ten Brink AF, Verwer JH, Biesbroek JM, Visser-Meily JMA, Nijboer TCW.
492 Differences between left- and right-sided neglect revisited: A large cohort study
493 across multiple domains. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol.* 2017;39:707–723.
- 494 48. Gialanella B, Ferlucci C. Functional outcome after stroke in patients with aphasia
495 and neglect: Assessment by the motor and cognitive functional independence
496 measure instrument. *Cerebrovas Dis.* 2010;30:440–447.
- 497 49. Bernhardt J, Churilov L, Ellery F, Collier J, Chamberlin J, Langhorne P, Lindley RI,
498 Moodie M, Dewey H, Thrift AG, et al. Prespecified dose-response analysis for A
499 Very Early Rehabilitation Trial (AVERT). *Neurology.* 2016;86:2138–2145.
- 500 50. Iwagami M, Matsui H. Introduction to clinical prediction models. *Ann Clin*
501 *Epidemiol.* 2022;4:72–80

502
503

504 **Figure Legend**

505 **Figure 1** Flow diagram of the patient section process

506 The data source was the Japan Association of Rehabilitation Database

507

508 Table 1. Patient Characteristics of the Study

Continuous variable	Mean (SD)	
Age, in years	73.7 (12.7)	
Length of stay, days	29.5 (21.4)	
	Admission	Discharge
Motor-FIM (admission: N=6,751, discharge: N=6,652)	33.4 (23.5)	57.0 (29.7)
Cognitive-FIM (admission: N=6,774, discharge: N=6,676)	20.8 (11.4)	24.1 (10.7)
FIM (total) (admission: N=6,821, discharge: N=6,726)	54.2 (32.6)	80.9 (39.1)
NIHSS (total) (admission: N=6,575, discharge: N=6,544)	8.3 (8.9)	6.2 (8.2)
Category variable	N (%)	
Sex Female	3,046 (44.3%)	
Type of stroke		
Lacunar infarction	1,091 (15.9%)	
Atherothrombotic cerebral infarction	1,697 (24.7%)	
Cardiogenic embolism	1,138 (16.5%)	
Cerebral infarction (Others/unknown)	614 (8.9%)	
Hypertensive cerebral hemorrhage	1,169 (17.0%)	
Cerebral hemorrhage (Others/unknown)	400 (5.8%)	

Subarachnoid hemorrhage 339 (4.9%)

Others/Unknown 60 (0.9%)

Missing 373 (5.4%)

Amount of rehabilitation per day

Less than 2 units (less than 40 min) 2,277 (33.1%)

2 or more to less than 4 units (40-80 min) 2,329 (33.8%)

4 or more to less than 6 units (80-120 min) 990 (14.4%)

6 or more units (more than 120 min) 1,285 (18.7%)

Admission Discharge

Motor arm of the NIHSS (right)

0	4,011	4,657
	(58.3%)	(67.7%)

1	889	584
	(12.9%)	(8.5%)

2	433 (6.3%)	348
		(5.1%)

3	390 (5.7%)	345
		(5.0%)

4	687	466
	(10.0%)	(6.8%)

Missing	471 (6.8%)	481
		(7.0%)

Motor arm of the NIHSS (left)

	0	3,921	4,527
		(57.0%)	(65.8%)
	1	864	599
		(12.6%)	(8.7%)
	2	477 (6.9%)	384
			(5.6%)
	3	424 (6.2%)	371
			(5.4%)
	4	723	519 7.5%)
		(10.5%)	
	Missing	472 (6.9%)	481
			(7.0%)
FIM locomotion (walk/wheelchair)			
	Complete dependence (1, 2)	4,995	2,372
		(72.6%)	(34.5%)
	Modified dependence (3-5)	1,199	1,557
		(17.4%)	(22.6%)
	Independence (6, 7)	610 (8.9%)	2,782
			(40.4%)
	Missing	77 (1.1%)	170
			(2.5%)
FIM toileting			
	Complete dependence (1, 2)	4,157	2,103
		(60.4%)	(30.6%)
	Modified dependence (3-5)	1,546	1,414

	(22.5%)	(20.5%)
Independence (6, 7)	1,099	3,198
	(16.0%)	(46.5%)
Missing	79 (1.1%)	166
		(2.4%)
FIM transfer (shower/bathtub)		
Complete dependence (1, 2)	6,128	2,982
	(89.1%)	(43.3%)
Modified dependence (3-5)	390 (5.7%)	1,841
		(26.8%)
Independence (6, 7)	286 (4.2%)	1,885
		(27.4%)
Missing	77 (1.1%)	173
		(2.5%)
FIM transfers		
(bed/chair/wheelchair)		
Complete dependence (1, 2)	3,888	1,486
	(56.5%)	(21.6%)
Modified dependence (3-5)	2,002	2,083
	(29.1%)	(30.3%)
Independence (6, 7)	921	3,146
	(13.4%)	(45.7%)
Missing	70 (1.0%)	166
		(2.4%)
FIM eating		

Complete dependence (1, 2)	3,098	1,454
	(45.0%)	(21.1%)
Modified dependence (3-5)	1,163	1,044
	(16.9%)	(15.2%)
Independence (6, 7)	2,554	4,219
	(37.1%)	(61.3%)
Missing	66 (1.0%)	164
		(2.4%)

FIM comprehension

Complete dependence (1, 2)	1,805	1,130
	(26.2%)	(16.4%)
Modified dependence (3-5)	1,828	1,818
	(26.6%)	(26.4%)
Independence (6, 7)	3,153	3,740
	(45.8%)	(54.4%)
Missing	95 (1.4%)	193
		(2.8%)

FIM expression

Complete dependence (1, 2)	2,019	1,354
	(29.3%)	(19.7%)
Modified dependence (3-5)	1,730	1,645
	(25.1%)	(23.9%)
Independence (6, 7)	3,036	3,689
	(44.1%)	(53.6%)
Missing	96 (1.4%)	193

		(2.8%)
FIM social interaction		
Complete dependence (1, 2)	2,413	1,459
	(35.1%)	(21.2%)
Modified dependence (3-5)	1,474	1,462
	(21.4%)	(21.2%)
Independence (6, 7)	2,916	3,788
	(42.4%)	(55.1%)
Missing	78 (1.1%)	172
		(2.5%)

Abbreviations: FIM, Functional Independence Measure (range, 18–126, higher = better); NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (range, 0–42, higher = worse); N, number of participants; SD, standard deviation

509

510

511 Table 2. Model-fit Statistics for LCA Models with 1–12 Classes

	LL	BIC	ΔBIC	AIC	ΔAIC	df	VLMR	Entropy R²	Smallest class size
1-Class	-82978	166230	-	166018	-	6858		1.00	—
2-Class	-62502	125561	40669	125130	40888	6826	40952	0.94	46%
3-Class	-56534	113907	11654	113257	11873	6794	11937	0.94	25%
4-Class	-54963	111048	2859	110180	3078	6762	3142	0.92	16%
5-Class	-53875	109155	1893	108068	2111	6730	2175	0.92	13%
6-Class	-53000	107688	1467	106383	1685	6698	1749	0.92	6.8%
7-Class	-52566	107102	586	105578	805	6666	869	0.91	6.0%
8-Class	-52218	106688	414	104945	633	6634	697	0.88	5.6%
9-Class	-51933	106403	286	104440	505	6602	569	0.88	4.5%
10-Class	-51763	106345	58	104164	277	6570	341	0.87	1.5%
11-Class	-51620	106341	3	103941	222	6538	286	0.87	1.5%
12-Class	-51498.6	106380	-39	103763	178	6498	242	0.86	1.4%

^aBased on model selection statistics, comparison of LCA models with different latent classes.

LCA, Latent class analysis; LL, Log-likelihood; BIC, Bayesian information criterion (lower values imply better model fit); AIC, Akaike information criterion (lower values imply better model fit); df, degree of freedom; VLMR, Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; Entropy, higher values imply better classification quality

512 Table 3. Class Sizes Belonging to Each Class and the Item Response Probabilities

	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6	Class 7	Class 8	Class 9	Over all
Class size	29%	15%	11%	10%	10%	9%	6%	6%	4%	
	Discharge	Discharge	Discharge	Discharge	Discharge	Discharge	Discharge	Discharge	Discharge	
	destination: Home	destination: different	destination: Home/different	destination: Different	destination: Different	destination: Different	destination: home	destination: Different	destination: Different	
	Length of stay: 1–14 days	Length of stay: ≥ 4 hospitals	Length of stay: ≥ 4 hospitals	Length of stay: 2–6	Length of stay: 2–6	Length of stay: ≥ 4	Length of stay: 1 day–6	Length of stay: 2–6	Length of stay: 2–6	
Summary	Upper extremity function: Mild disability	Upper extremity function: Severe	Upper extremity function: Mild	Upper extremity function: Mild	Upper extremity function: Mild	Upper extremity function: Moderate	Upper extremity function: Mild	Upper extremity function: Moderate	Upper extremity function: Moderate	

Functional	disability	function:	disability	disability	disability	disability	disability	disability
ability:	Functional	Mild	Functional	Functional	(left)	Functional	(left)	(right)
Independe	ability:	disability	ability:	ability:	Functional	ability:	Functional	Functional
nce	Complete	Functional	Independe	Modified	ability:	Independe	ability:	ability:
Communi	dependenc	ability:	nce or	dependenc	Complete	nce	Modified/Co	Moderate/Co
cation and	e	Independe	modified	e (Eating:	dependenc	(Transfer	mplete	mplete
social	Communi	nce	dependenc	Independe	e	of	dependence	dependence
interaction	cation and	(Transfer	e (Transfer	nce)	Communi	shower/bat	(Eating:	Communicati
:	social	of	of	Communi	cation and	htub:	Independenc	on and social
Independe	interaction	shower/bat	shower/bat	cation and	social	Modified	e)	interaction:
nce	:	htub:	htub:	social	interaction	dependenc	Communicat	Complete
	Complete	Modified	Complete	interaction	: Modified	e)	ion and	dependence
	dependenc	dependenc	dependenc	:	dependenc	Communi	social	
	e	e)	e)	Independe	e	cation and	interaction:	
		Communi	Communi	nce		social	Independenc	
		cation and	cation and			interaction	e	

Discharge destination	social interaction		social interaction		Independence		: Modified dependence		: Modified dependence	
	97%	4%	46%	30%	35%	7%	64%	5%	9%	46%
Home	97%	4%	46%	30%	35%	7%	64%	5%	9%	46%
Transfer to a different hospital	1%	77%	52%	61%	60%	82%	33%	91%	81%	48%
Transfer to a facility	1%	7%	1%	6%	4%	7%	1%	3%	7%	4%
Death	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Others	1%	5%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%

Length of stay											
<2 weeks (1–14 days)	55%	8%	6%	16%	19%	9%	21%	5%	6%	24%	
2–4 weeks (15–28 days)	35%	19%	50%	40%	40%	28%	42%	33%	34%	35%	
4–6 weeks (29–42 days)	7%	28%	25%	24%	27%	29%	21%	36%	32%	21%	
>6 weeks (>42 days)	3%	44%	19%	21%	14%	35%	16%	27%	28%	20%	
NIHSS score											
Right motor arm											
0	97%	20%	85%	74%	79%	54%	91%	77%	40%	72%	
1	3%	9%	11%	17%	13%	17%	5%	5%	15%	9%	
2	0%	16%	2%	4%	4%	13%	1%	5%	14%	6%	

3	0%	17%	2%	4%	3%	9%	1%	9%	16%	6%
4	0%	37%	1%	1%	1%	7%	1%	4%	15%	8%
Left motor arm										
0	96%	24%	81%	77%	72%	37%	96%	35%	84%	70%
1	3%	11%	12%	15%	14%	12%	2%	17%	11%	9%
2	0%	15%	3%	4%	6%	14%	1%	16%	4%	6%
3	0%	16%	2%	3%	6%	16%	0%	19%	0%	6%
4	0%	35%	1%	1%	2%	20%	0%	14%	0%	8%
FiM item										
Eating										
Complete dependence	0%	95%	1%	7%	1%	47%	0%	17%	34%	22%
Modified	0%	5%	3%	42%	16%	45%	7%	39%	45%	16%

dependence										
Independence	100%	1%	96%	51%	83%	9%	93%	44%	22%	62%
Transfer (bed/chair/whe elchair)										
Complete	0%	97%	0%	0%	0%	66%	0%	27%	3%	22%
dependence										
Modified	1%	3%	2%	97%	88%	34%	7%	73%	96%	31%
dependence										
Independence	99%	0%	98%	3%	12%	0%	93%	0%	1%	47%
Toileting										
Complete	0%	100%	0%	11%	3%	96%	0%	69%	54%	32%
dependence										
Modified	0%	0%	5%	86%	73%	4%	13%	31%	46%	21%
dependence										

Independence	100%	0%	95%	3%	23%	0%	87%	0%	0%	47%
Locomotion (walk/wheelchair)										
Complete dependence	0%	99%	1%	27%	15%	97%	1%	86%	56%	36%
Modified dependence	3%	1%	22%	72%	81%	3%	32%	13%	44%	23%
Independence	97%	0%	78%	1%	4%	0%	67%	1%	0%	41%
Transfer (shower/bathroom)										
Complete dependence	7%	100%	5%	57%	32%	99%	11%	90%	76%	45%
Modified dependence	18%	0%	56%	43%	68%	1%	57%	10%	24%	27%

dependence											
Independence	75%	0%	39%	0%	0%	0%	32%	0%	0%	28%	
Communication (comprehension)											
Complete dependence	0%	92%	0%	2%	0%	4%	4%	0%	55%	17%	
Modified dependence	1%	8%	0%	92%	4%	91%	87%	9%	43%	27%	
Independence	99%	0%	100%	5%	96%	5%	9%	91%	2%	56%	
Communication (expression)											
Complete dependence	0%	99%	0%	2%	0%	13%	10%	0%	80%	21%	

Modified dependence	1%	1%	6%	90%	6%	84%	77%	11%	20%	25%
Independence	99%	0%	93%	8%	93%	3%	13%	89%	0%	55%
Social interaction										
Complete dependence	0%	95%	0%	16%	1%	33%	8%	3%	54%	22%
Modified dependence	3%	4%	7%	65%	17%	56%	54%	25%	35%	22%
Independence	97%	1%	93%	19%	82%	11%	38%	72%	11%	56%




Figure 1 Flow diagram of the patient selection process

The data source was the Japan Association of Rehabilitation Database