

Title page

The impact of patient-centered care on quality of life and hope among patients receiving home medical care: The Zaitaku Evaluative Initiatives and Outcome Study

Hidekazu Iida, MD, MPH, PhD^{1,3,4}, Shinu Hayashi, MD, MPH^{2,3}, Masakazu Yasunaka, MD^{5,6}; Yukio Tsugihashi, MD, MPH, PhD^{7,8} Misaki Hirose, MD, PhD^{5,9}; Yutaka Shirahige, MD, PhD^{5,10}; Noriaki Kurita, MD, PhD^{3,11,12}, and the ZEVIIOUS group[†]

[†]Other members of the ZEVIIOUS Group are listed in the Supplementary Text.

¹You Home Clinic, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan

²You Home Clinic Heiwadai, Nerima-ku, Tokyo, Japan

³Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Graduate School of Medicine, Fukushima Medical University, Fukushima-city, Fukushima, Japan

⁴Center for Next Generation of Community Health, Chiba University Hospital, Chiba-city, Chiba, Japan

⁵Dr. Net Nagasaki, Nagasaki-city, Nagasaki, Japan

⁶Yasunaka Neurosurgery Clinic, Nagasaki-city, Nagasaki, Japan

⁷Medical Home Care Center, Tenri Hospital Shirakawa Branch, Tenri-city, Nara, Japan

⁸Department of Public Health, Health Management, and Policy, Nara Medical University, Kashihara-city, Nara, Japan

⁹Hirose Clinic, Nagasaki-city, Nagasaki, Japan

¹⁰Shirahige Clinic, Nagasaki-city, Nagasaki, Japan

¹¹Department of Innovative Research and Education for Clinicians and Trainees (DiRECT),
Fukushima Medical University Hospital, Fukushima-city, Fukushima, Japan

¹²Center for Innovative Research for Communities and Clinical Excellence (CiRC²LE),
Fukushima Medical University, Fukushima-city, Fukushima, Japan

Corresponding Author:

Noriaki Kurita, MD, PhD

Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Graduate School of Medicine, Fukushima Medical
University, Fukushima-city, Fukushima, Japan

Running title: Patient-centered care for home medical care

Keywords: patient-centered care, quality of life, Health-related hope, home medical care

Funding sources: This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant Number 16H05216
and 23K1470).

1

Abstract

2 **Objectives:** This study aimed to examine the correlation between the quality of patient-
3 centered care and quality of life and hope among patients receiving home medical care.

4 **Design:** Multicenter cross-sectional study

5 **Setting and Participants:** This study was part of the Zaitaku Evaluative Initiatives and
6 Outcome Study involving 29 home care clinics in Japan. The participants were patients
7 receiving home medical care who were judged capable of responding to the questionnaire
8 survey by their attending physician.

9 **Methods:** Patient centeredness, the exposure variable, was measured using the Japanese
10 version of the Primary Care Assessment Tool–Short Form (JPCAT-SF). Outcomes, namely
11 quality of life and hope, were measured utilizing the Quality of Life-Home Care (QOL-HC)
12 and Health-Related Hope (HR-Hope) scales, respectively. Mixed-effects linear regression
13 models were applied, incorporating covariates such as age, sex, education, family member
14 presence, comorbidities (primary and other), depressive symptoms, residence type, and
15 patient life expectancy.

16 **Results:** Among the 194 participants, a notable association was found, wherein a higher
17 JPCAT-SF total score correlated with an elevated QOL-HC score (adjusted mean difference
18 per 10-point increase: 0.29, 95% CI: 0.17–0.42). Within the JPCAT-SF domains, elevated
19 scores for first contact, longitudinality, comprehensiveness, and community orientation were
20 correlated with higher QOL-HC scores. Additionally, a higher JPCAT-SF total score was
21 associated with elevated HR-Hope levels (adjusted mean difference per 10-point increase:
22 5.1, 95% CI: 3.2–7). Higher scores for first contact, longitudinality, coordination,

23 comprehensiveness, and community orientation were associated with higher HR-Hope
24 scores.

25 **Conclusions and Implications:** The findings underscore that higher quality patient-centered
26 care is positively associated with enhanced quality of life and hope among home medical care
27 patients. This study highlights the importance of strengthening patient centeredness in daily
28 clinical practice.

29 **Introduction**

30 Maintaining or improving function and well-being are central goals in caring for patients
31 requiring home medical care when patients have chronic or progressive illnesses for which
32 there is no cure or for which treatment is not feasible.¹ Thus, patient-reported outcomes
33 (PROs), which reflect quality of life (QOL) and hope, are essential targets for in-home
34 medical care. Nevertheless, QOL among patients receiving home medical care is often
35 underestimated owing to such patients' limited activities of daily living (ADLs).² Empirical
36 evidence on approaches that home medicine physicians can implement to improve their
37 patients' QOL is scarce compared with approaches for outpatient and nursing home settings.
38 For example, patient-centered care for patients with type 2 diabetes was associated with
39 physical and mental health related-QOL.³ In nursing home settings, patient-centered care,
40 such as building close relationships and collaborative decision-making, was associated with
41 better QOL.⁴

42 Hope is considered an essential coping strategy,⁵ given that it is the only thing that patients
43 can do in a clinical oncology setting when they may seem to be unable to do anything.⁶ The
44 benefit of hope is supported by empirical evidence showing that higher hope is associated
45 with lesser pain and psychological distress among patients with lung cancer.⁷ Furthermore,

46 hope has been identified as an essential theme of patient-centered care for chronic illnesses.⁸

47 Despite the importance of QOL and the potential of hope in improving patient outcomes,

48 there is a shortage of empirical research showing that providing patient-centered care

49 improves these outcomes among patients receiving home medical care.⁸

50 In-home medical care for adults with mental health problems in the United Kingdom,

51 providing elements constituting patient-centered care, such as sufficient time to talk and

52 resolving patients' problems, was positively correlated with hope.⁹ However, patient-centered

53 care comprises multiple broad domains such as first contact (refers to access to medical care,

54 including availability outside regular hours or on days off) and longitudinality (refers to

55 understanding the whole person and not just the disease).¹⁰ In addition, whether patient-

56 centered care can ensure the maintenance of QOL and hope among patients with impaired

57 physical functioning due to chronic illness rather than psychological problems has not been

58 examined. Clarifying this issue could contribute to further empirical work leading to an

59 understanding of how attending physicians can provide patient-centered home medical care.⁸

60 Therefore, we conducted a multicenter cross-sectional study using data from the Zaitaku

61 Evaluative Initiatives and Outcome Study (ZEVIIOUS) to examine the association of the

62 quality of patient-centered care with QOL and hope among patients receiving home medical

63 care.

64 **Methods**

65 **Design, Setting, and Participants**

66 This study was part of ZEVIIOUS, a multicenter cross-sectional study involving 29 home care

67 clinics in the Tokyo Metropolitan area, Nara Prefecture, and Nagasaki Prefecture in Japan.

68 The inclusion criteria were patients receiving home medical care, as determined by their

69 attending physicians, and judged capable of responding to the questionnaire survey. The
70 questionnaire was distributed to each patient between January and July 2020, and the patients
71 were requested to complete the survey. Patients with visual impairments or physical
72 disabilities that prevented them from writing were permitted assistance by a family member
73 or formal caregiver in answering the survey. The study protocol was approved by the
74 Institutional Review Board of Fukushima Medical University.

75 **Patient centeredness as an Exposure**

76 The Japanese version of the Primary Care Assessment Tool–Short Form (JPCAT-SF) was
77 used to measure patient centeredness in primary care settings.¹⁰ The JPCAT-SF comprises 13
78 items encompassing six domains representing five primary care attributes: first contact (two
79 items), longitudinality (two items), coordination (three items), comprehensiveness (two items
80 for “services available” and two items for “services provided”), and community orientation
81 (two items). Detailed information regarding the items, scoring, psychometric properties, and
82 domains of the JPCAT-SF can be found in the supplementary information (Table S1, Text
83 S1). Participants rated each item on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree
84 to strongly agree. We converted the responses to item scores ranging from 0 to 4 points.
85 Domain scores were calculated by multiplying the average item scores within the same
86 domain by 25, resulting in a range of 0–100 points, with higher scores indicating better
87 performance. The total score represents an overall measure of the patient centeredness of
88 primary care and was calculated as the average of the six domain scores.

89 **QOL and Hope as Outcomes**

90 The Quality of Life-Home Care (QOL-HC) is a four-item questionnaire that assesses the
91 QOL of older patients receiving home medical care.¹¹ Kamitani et al. demonstrated the face

92 validity of the QOL-HC through item derivation by physicians and care managers and item
93 selection by geriatricians.¹¹ Each item is rated on a three-point scale, ranging from “never
94 agree” (0 points) to “always agree” (2 points), resulting in a total score ranging from 0 to 8
95 points. (Table S2)

96 The Health-Related Hope (HR-Hope) Scale is an 18-item, unidimensional scale designed to
97 evaluate HR-Hope among individuals with chronic conditions.¹² Through structural
98 validation, the scale comprises three subdomains: “something to live for” (five items), “health
99 and illness” (six items), and “role and connectedness” (seven items) (Supplementary Table).¹²
100 Participants rate their responses to each item on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = I
101 do not feel that way at all to 4 = I strongly feel that way. After obtaining the average score for
102 each subdomain and the total score, the scores are scaled from 0 to 100 points. Patients
103 without family were exempted from answering two items in the “role and connectedness”
104 subdomain.(Table S3)

105 **Covariates**

106 Demographic information, such as age, sex, education, and the presence of family members,
107 was collected through a questionnaire. The physician-in-charge provided data on
108 comorbidities, type of residence, and patient life expectancy. Regarding the patient’s life
109 expectancy, the home medical care physician assigned to the patient answered the following
110 question: “What diseases were the leading cause of introducing home medical care?” The
111 physicians were allowed to choose from the following options: cerebrovascular disease, heart
112 disease, cancer, respiratory disease, joint disease, dementia, incurable neuromuscular disease,
113 diabetes, visual and hearing impairment, fractures and falls, spinal cord disease, infirmity,
114 other, and unknown. Regarding type of residence, the physicians answered the question:
115 “What is the type of residence?” The following options were provided: home, care home for

116 older adults, retirement home, group home (for patients with dementia), multifunctional long-
117 term care in a small group home, and short stay. We classified the responses into those with
118 homes and those without homes (nursing homes). Lastly, physicians were asked “How long
119 do you expect the clinical prognosis (life expectancy) of this patient to be?” They were
120 allowed to choose from five options: “less than one month,” “more than one month to less
121 than three months,” “more than three months to less than six months,” “more than six months
122 to less than 12 months,” and “more than 12 months.” Depressive symptoms were assessed
123 using the five-question Mental Health Inventory (MHI-5).¹³ The MHI-5 scores were
124 calculated according to a previous study, and the total score was converted to 0–100. A score
125 of ≤ 52 on the MHI-5 was defined as having depression.¹³

126 **Statistical Analysis**

127 Statistical analyses were performed using Stata/SE version 15 (StataCorp, College Station,
128 TX, USA). Patient characteristics were described using means and standard deviations for
129 continuous variables and frequencies and percentages for categorical variables. Mixed-effects
130 linear regression models were utilized to estimate the association between JPCAT-SF scores
131 and QOL-HC and HR-Hope scores, considering clustering effects by the facility. Robust
132 variance estimation was used for the QOL-HC analysis because the scale did not meet the
133 standard assumptions of equal variance and normality. Age, sex, educational attainment,
134 family presence, depressive symptoms, patient life expectancy, and comorbidities were
135 included as covariates in the models.

136 Additionally, the models were fitted, in which each of the six domain scores of the JPCAT-
137 SF was treated as an explanatory variable. Missing covariate data were addressed using
138 multiple imputations with chained equations, assuming that the mechanism of missing data

139 was random. The imputed data were analyzed five times.¹⁴ Statistical significance was
140 defined as $p < 0.05$.

141 **Result**

142 **Patient Characteristics**

143 Of the 202 patients who received home medical care, eight without a JPCAT-SF score were
144 excluded, resulting in a final sample size of 194 patients for analysis. Patient characteristics
145 are presented in Table 1.

146 **Association between JPCAT-SF, QOL-HC, and HR-Hope**

147 Table 2 presents the association between the JPCAT-SF total score and QOL-HC. Higher
148 total JPCAT-SF scores were associated with higher QOL-HC scores (adjusted mean
149 difference for every 10-point increase: 0.29, 95% CI: 0.17–0.42). Age was also positively
150 associated with QOL-HC (every ten years increase: 0.18, 95% CI: 0.05–0.3). Depressive
151 symptoms were negatively associated with QOL-HC (-0.89, 95% CI: -1.36–0.43). Sex,
152 education level, family presence, expected prognosis, and comorbidities were not
153 significantly associated with QOL-HC. The associations between each JPCAT-SF domain
154 and QOL-HC are presented in Table 3. Among the JPCAT-SF domains, higher scores in first
155 contact (0.15, 95% CI: 0.06–0.25), longitudinality (0.21, 95% CI: 0.10–0.31),
156 comprehensiveness (services available: 0.11, 95% CI: 0.03–0.20; services provided: 0.08,
157 95% CI: 0.03–0.13), and community orientation (0.10, 95% CI: 0.02–0.18) were associated
158 with higher QOL-HC scores, whereas coordination (0.03, 95% CI: -0.03–0.10) showed a
159 non-significant association.

160 Table 4 shows the association between the JPCAT-SF total score and HR-Hope. Higher total
161 JPCAT-SF scores were associated with higher levels of HR-Hope (adjusted mean difference

162 for every 10-point increase: 5.1, 95% CI: 3.2–7). Negative associations with HR-Hope were
163 observed for expected prognosis (-16, 95% CI: -29–3) and depressive symptoms (-12.9, 95%
164 CI: -18.9–6.9). Sex, education level, family presence, and comorbidities were not
165 significantly associated. The associations between each JPCAT-SF domain and HR-Hope are
166 presented in Table 5. Higher scores in first contact (2.6, 95% CI: 1.19–4.18), longitudinality
167 (2.7, 95% CI: 1.07–4.43), coordination (1.2, 95% CI: 0.13–2.36), comprehensiveness
168 (services available: 1.9, 95% CI: 0.55–3.38; services provided: 1.5, 95% CI: 0.07–2.38), and
169 community orientation (2.4, 95% CI: 1.13–3.79) were associated with higher QOL-HC
170 scores.

171 **Discussion**

172 This study examined the association of quality of patient-centered care with QOL-HC and
173 HR-Hope among patients receiving home medical care. Higher levels of patient centeredness,
174 as measured using the JPCAT-SF, were associated with better QOL-HC and higher HR-
175 Hope. In particular, the “first contact” and “longitudinality” domains of the JPCAT-SF were
176 strongly associated with QOL-HC and HR-Hope.

177

178 Previous studies have also highlighted the importance of first contact and longitudinality in
179 fostering hope through effective communication. For example, research involving
180 psychologically ill patients receiving home medical care found that hope was associated with
181 patients having sufficient time to communicate with their doctors and address their concerns.⁹
182 Additionally, studies involving terminally ill patients with malignancies have emphasized the
183 role of communication in maintaining hope.⁵ However, the concepts and measurements of
184 hope in these studies have not been structured or validated. Furthermore, the limitations of
185 these studies include their specific focus on psychology and end-of-life patients with

186 malignancies, which restrict the generalizability of their findings. Previous studies have
187 shown that patient-centered care improves QOL in different populations, including
188 outpatients with type 2 diabetes and nursing home residents.^{3,4}

189

190 The results of the present study have several clinical implications. First, within the JPCAT
191 domains, first contact and longitudinality were found to have stronger associations with
192 QOL-HC and HR-Hope compared with other domains. These domains closely align with the
193 communication pathway, particularly “access to care” and “enhancing therapeutic alliance.”
194 Improving first contact by providing better access to care based on patient requests and
195 understanding patients as individuals within the context of their life histories can significantly
196 impact QOL and hope. Second, while previous studies have focused on developing additional
197 programs, such as psychosocial supportive interventions, to improve patients’ hope, this
198 study highlights the importance of enhancing patient centeredness in daily clinical practice.
199 Improving daily clinical practice by prioritizing patient-centered conversations is more
200 crucial than developing new programs. From this perspective, for example, a patient-centered
201 conversation program developed for patients with chronic kidney disease to promote
202 advanced care planning that promotes sharing patients’ values and preferences about
203 treatment, their families, and everyday life among medical providers, patients, and their
204 families could be applied to home medical care.¹⁵

205

206 This study had several strengths. First, using validated scales, we could quantify the
207 associations between patient centeredness, QOL, and hope for the first time. Second, our
208 findings are generalizable because of the multicenter nature of the study, which was
209 conducted in both rural and urban areas of Japan. Third, by controlling for confounding

210 variables, such as life expectancy and depressive symptoms, we could correctly estimate the
211 associations of patient-centered care with QOL and hope.

212

213 Nonetheless, this study has several limitations. First, the possibility of reverse causation
214 remains because of the study's cross-sectional design. For example, because patients were
215 highly hopeful about their health, their home physicians may have responded to this and
216 provided them with good patient-centered care. Second, because this study excluded patients
217 with severe dementia and those who were unable to respond, the findings may not be
218 generalizable to these populations.

219

220

Conclusion

221 In conclusion, our study revealed that better patient-centered care was associated with a
222 higher QoL and hope among patients receiving home medical care. Further empirical
223 research is warranted to determine whether efforts to holistically understand patients and
224 promptly provide timely home medical care tailored to patients' individual needs can
225 improve patients' overall well-being and hope.

226 **Conflict of Interest:** No conflict of interest

227

228 **References**

- 229 1. Revicki D, Hays RD, Cella D, et al. Recommended methods for determining
230 responsiveness and minimally important differences for patient-reported outcomes. *J*
231 *Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61(2):102-109.
- 232 2. Miyashita M, Narita Y, Sakamoto A, et al. Health-related quality of life among
233 community-dwelling patients with intractable neurological diseases and their caregivers
234 in Japan. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2011;65(1):30-38. doi:10.1111/j.1440-
235 1819.2010.02155.x
- 236 3. Lee YY, Lin JL. Do patient autonomy preferences matter? Linking patient-centered care
237 to patient-physician relationships and health outcomes. *Soc Sci Med* 2010;71(10):1811-
238 1818. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.08.008
- 239 4. Koren MJ. Person-centered care for nursing home residents: The culture-change
240 movement. *Health Aff* 2010;29(2):312-317. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2009.0966
- 241 5. Clayton JM, Butow PN, Arnold RM, et al. Fostering coping and nurturing hope when
242 discussing the future with terminally ill cancer patients and their caregivers. *Cancer*
243 2005;103(9):1965-1975. doi:10.1002/cncr.21011
- 244 6. Standish K. Learning how to hope: A hope curriculum. *Humanity Soc* 2019;43(4):484-
245 504. doi:10.1177/0160597618814886
- 246 7. Berendes D, Keefe FJ, Somers TJ, et al. Hope in the context of lung cancer:
247 Relationships of hope to symptoms and psychological distress. *J Pain Symptom Manage*
248 2010;40(2):174-182. doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2010.01.014
- 249 8. Hudon C, Fortin M, Haggerty J, et al. Patient-centered care in chronic disease

- 250 management: A thematic analysis of the literature in family medicine. *Patient Educ*
251 *Couns* 2012;88(2):170-176. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2012.01.009
- 252 9. Hubbeling D, Bertram R. Hope, happiness and home treatment: A study into patient
253 satisfaction with being treated at home. *Psychiatr Bull* 2014;38(6):265-269.
254 doi:10.1192/pb.bp.112.040188
- 255 10. Aoki T, Fukuhara S, Yamamoto Y. Development and validation of a concise scale for
256 assessing patient experience of primary care for adults in Japan. *Fam Pract*
257 2020;37(1):137-142. doi:10.1093/fampra/cmz038
- 258 11. Kamitani H, Umegaki H, Okamoto K, et al. Development and validation of a new
259 quality of life scale for patients receiving home-based medical care: The Observational
260 Study of Nagoya Elderly with Home Medical Care. *Geriatr Gerontol Int*
261 2017;17(3):440-448. doi:10.1111/ggi.12735
- 262 12. Fukuhara S, Kurita N, Wakita T, et al. A scale for measuring health-related hope: Its
263 development and psychometric testing. *Ann Clin Epidemiol* 2019;1(3):102-119.
264 doi:10.37737/ace.1.3_102
- 265 13. Yamazaki S, Fukuhara S, Green J. Usefulness of five-item and three-item Mental Health
266 Inventories to screen for depressive symptoms in the general population of Japan. *Health*
267 *Qual Life Outcomes* 2005;3:48. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-3-48
- 268 14. Austin PC, White IR, Lee DS, et al. Missing data in clinical research: A tutorial on
269 multiple imputation. *Can J Cardiol* 2021;37(9):1322-1331.
270 doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2020.11.010
- 271 15. Frandsen CE, Dieperink H, Trettin B, et al. Advance care planning to patients with

272 chronic kidney disease and their families: An intervention development study. J Clin

273 Nurs Published online September 24, 2023. doi:10.1111/jocn.16875

274

275 **Table 1. Characteristics of patients (n= 194)**

Demographics	Total
	n = 194
Age, yr	80 (14.1)
Women, n (%)	116 (59.8 %)
Education, n (%)	
<i>Elementary school or junior high school</i>	66 (34.6 %)
<i>High school</i>	62 (32.5 %)
<i>College, university, or graduate school</i>	63 (33 %)
<i>missing, n</i>	3
Presence of family, n (%)	171 (88.1 %)
Depressive symptom, n (%)	66 (34.6 %)
<i>missing, n</i>	3
Expected prognosis, n (%)	
<i>>=12mo</i>	158 (81.9 %)
<i>6-<12mo</i>	23 (11.9 %)
<i><6mo</i>	12 (6.2 %)
<i>missing, n</i>	1

Comorbidities, n (%)

<i>Cerebrovascular disease</i>	34 (17.5 %)
<i>Heart disease</i>	59 (30.4 %)
<i>Malignancy</i>	26 (13.4 %)
<i>Respiratory disease</i>	33 (17 %)
<i>Articular disease</i>	26 (13.4 %)
<i>Dementia</i>	37 (19.1 %)
<i>Neuromuscular disease</i>	23 (11.9 %)
<i>Fracture/Fall</i>	20 (10.3 %)
<i>Weakness</i>	36 (18.6 %)
<i>Spinal cord injury</i>	7 (3.6 %)

276

277

278 **Table 2. Associations between patient experience and QOL-HC^a (n = 189)**

QOL-HC, points	Mean difference (95% CI)	P-value
<i>JPCAT-SF, total, per 10 pt</i>	<i>0.29 (0.17 - 0.42)*</i>	<i><0.001</i>
<i>Age, per 10 y</i>	<i>0.18 (0.05 - 0.3)*</i>	<i>0.005</i>
<i>Women vs. Men</i>	<i>0.18 (-0.24 - 0.6)</i>	<i>0.398</i>
<i>Educational attainment</i>		
<i>Junior high school or lower</i>	<i>-0.17 (-0.64 - 0.3)</i>	<i>0.474</i>
<i>High school</i>	<i>-0.31 (-0.69 - 0.07)</i>	<i>0.114</i>
<i>College/University/Graduate school/Other</i>	Reference	
<i>Presence of family</i>	<i>0.01 (-0.53 - 0.55)</i>	<i>0.974</i>
<i>Expected prognosis</i>		
<i>>=12 month</i>	Reference	
<i>6-<12 month</i>	<i>0.26 (-0.15 - 0.67)</i>	<i>0.214</i>
<i><6 month</i>	<i>0.43 (-0.15 - 1.01)</i>	<i>0.145</i>
<i>Depressive symptom</i>	<i>-0.89 (-1.36 - -0.43)*</i>	<i><0.001</i>
<i>Comorbidities</i>		
<i>Cerebrovascular disease</i>	<i>0.12 (-0.57 - 0.8)</i>	<i>0.742</i>

<i>Heart disease</i>	-0.06 (-0.41 - 0.29)	0.725
<i>Malignancy</i>	-0.38 (-0.8 - 0.04)	0.074
<i>Respiratory disease</i>	0.44 (-0.08 - 0.97)	0.100
<i>Articular disease</i>	-0.2 (-0.8 - 0.41)	0.525
<i>Dementia</i>	0.38 (-0.11 - 0.86)	0.128
<i>Neuromuscular disease</i>	-0.09 (-0.66 - 0.49)	0.768
<i>Fracture/Fall</i>	-0.15 (-0.78 - 0.48)	0.644
<i>Weakness</i>	-0.26 (-0.78 - 0.25)	0.315
<i>Spinal cord injury</i>	0.13 (-0.62 - 0.87)	0.740

279 Analysis of 189 patients among 29 facilities.

280 ^aMixed-effects linear regression model adjusted for covariates listed above.

281 ***statistically significant**

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293 **Table 3. Associations between JPCAT-SF domain and QOL-HC^a (n = 189)**

QOL, points	Mean difference (95% CI)	P-value
<i>First contact, per 10 pt</i>	<i>0.15 (0.06–0.25)*</i>	<i>0.0001</i>
<i>Longitudinality, per 10 pt</i>	<i>0.21 (0.10–0.31)*</i>	<i>0.00</i>
<i>Coordination, per 10 pt</i>	<i>0.03 (-0.03–0.10)*</i>	<i>0.30</i>
<i>Comprehensiveness (needs service), per 10 pt</i>	<i>0.11 (0.03–0.20)*</i>	<i>0.008</i>
<i>Comprehensiveness(service), per 10 pt</i>	<i>0.08 (0.03–0.13)*</i>	<i>0.002</i>
<i>Community Orientation, per 10 pt</i>	<i>0.10 (0.02–0.18)*</i>	<i>0.014</i>

294 Analysis of 189 patients among 29 facilities.

295 ^aMixed-effects linear regression model adjusted for covariates listed in Table 2.

296 ***statistically significant**

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307 **Table 4. Associations between JPCAT-SF and HR-Hope^a (n = 194)**

HR-Hope, points	Mean difference (95% CI)	P-value
<i>JPCAT-SF, total, per 10 pt</i>	5.1 (3.2 - 7)*	<0.001
Age, per 10 y	-0.8 (-3.2 - 1.6)	0.512
Women vs. Men	1.3 (-5 - 7.6)	0.681
Educational attainment		
<i>Junior high school or lower</i>	-2.6 (-9.9 - 4.7)	0.484
<i>High school</i>	-6.6 (-14 - 0.7)	0.077
<i>College/University/Graduate school/Other</i>	Reference	
Presence of family	-4.6 (-13.2 - 4.1)	0.303
Expected prognosis		
<i>>=12 month</i>	Reference	
<i>6-<12 month</i>	-3 (-12.5 - 6.5)	0.532
<i><6 month</i>	-16 (-29 - -3)*	0.016
<i>Depressive symptom</i>	-12.9 (-18.9 - -6.9)*	<0.001
Comorbidities		

<i>Cerebrovascular disease</i>	-5.7 (-13.6 - 2.1)	0.149
<i>Heart disease</i>	2.9 (-3.6 - 9.5)	0.383
<i>Malignancy</i>	6.3 (-3.3 - 15.9)	0.201
<i>Respiratory disease</i>	-3.6 (-11.3 - 4.1)	0.364
<i>Articular disease</i>	-3.1 (-11.6 - 5.4)	0.477
<i>Dementia</i>	4.3 (-3.6 - 12.3)	0.285
<i>Neuromuscular disease</i>	-1.4 (-11.3 - 8.5)	0.786
<i>Fracture/Fall</i>	3.9 (-5.6 - 13.5)	0.419
<i>Weakness</i>	-1.6 (-10.3 - 7)	0.714
<i>Spinal cord injury</i>	-5.8 (-21.9 - 10.3)	0.481

308 Analysis of 194 patients among 29 facilities.

309 Mixed-effects linear regression models adjusted for covariates listed above.

310 ***statistically significant**

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321 **Table 5. Associations between JPCAT-SF domain and HR-Hope^a (n = 194)**

HR-Hope, points	Mean difference (95% CI)	P-value
<i>First contact, per 10 pt</i>	2.6 (1.2–4.2)*	0.00
<i>Longitudinality, per 10 pt</i>	2.7 (1.1–4.4)*	0.00
<i>Coordination, per 10 pt</i>	1.2 (0.1–2.4)*	0.02
<i>Comprehensiveness (service available), per 10 pt</i>	1.9 (0.6–3.4)*	0.007
<i>Comprehensiveness(service provided), per 10 pt</i>	1.5 (0.1–2.4)*	0.004
<i>Community Orientation, per 10 pt</i>	2.4 (1.1–3.8)*	0.00

322 Analysis of 194 patients among 29 facilities.

323 ^aMixed-effects linear regression model adjusted for covariates listed in Table 4.

324 ***statistically significant**

325

326