

1 **Self-Rehabilitation Strategy for Rural Community-dwelling Stroke Survivors in a Lower-**
2 **Middle Income Country: A Delphi Study**

3 Rabi’u Ibrahim^{1*¶}, Conran Joseph^{2&}, Aimée Stewart^{3,&} Isa Usman Lawal^{4#a¶},

4 ¹Directorate of Health Services, Department of Hospital Services, Physiotherapy Division,
5 National Assembly Abuja, Nigeria.

6 ² Department of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, Division of Physiotherapy, Stellenbosch University,
7 Cape Town, South Africa.

8 ³Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand,
9 Johannesburg, South Africa.

10 ⁴Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, College of Health Sciences,
11 Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria.

12 ^{#a}Department of Physiotherapy, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Skyline University Nigeria.

13 *Corresponding author

14 E-mail: tok2rabs@gmail.com (RI)

15

16 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

17 &These authors also contributed equally to this work.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Background: More than half of stroke survivors in LMICs lack access to stroke rehabilitation
26 services. The promotion of self-rehabilitation could be promising in an attempt to address the
27 stroke rehabilitation inadequacies in LMICs. Self-rehabilitation interventions can easily be
28 accepted by many community-dwelling stroke survivors, and therefore, have the potential to
29 drive towards the successful realization of Sustainable Development Goals and other WHO
30 rehabilitation goals. We report a consensus building process that sought to identify which task
31 training is relevant to include in a task-specific self-rehabilitation strategy for the rural
32 community-dwelling stroke survivors.

33 Methods: We used an iterative two-staged mixed-method consensus-building approach: (1) focus
34 group discussions (n = 5) with rural community-dwelling stroke survivors were conducted to
35 explore personal life experiences in performing daily activities, and the results were used to
36 developed a lists of candidate task trainings that could be included in a task-specific self-
37 rehabilitation intervention model for improving functional ability post-stroke survivors; (2) a
38 three-round Delphi exercise with a panel of stroke rehabilitation experts to establish consensus
39 on the importance/relevance of the developed task trainings. Consensus was pre-defined to be the
40 point where the proportion of items giving a rating of 3 (quite relevant) or 4 (highly relevant) by
41 raters would be ≥ 0.8 .

42 Results: A list of 74 task training was generated from the results of the focus groups and grouped
43 as follows: training for the upper extremity (37); lower extremity training (21); while 7 and 9
44 task trainings were grouped under the trunk and balance training respectively. A panel of 13
45 experts in the Delphi reviewed these task trainings and consensus was achieved on keeping 28
46 task trainings in the first round and an additional 7 in the second round. In the study team's

47 analysis of open text responses, several areas of debate were identified and some task trainings
48 were modified. The exercise yielded 49 trainings (66% of 74) on which there was consensus (the
49 mean proportion of items giving a rating of 3 or 4 by raters was 0.93) to keep 3 task training
50 groups relating to: upper extremity (27), lower extremity/balance (8), trunk strength (4) and
51 warm up exercises (10).

52 Conclusions: The study provides a consensus-based view of the features of a task-specific self-
53 rehabilitation training strategy to improve outcomes following a stroke. This self-rehabilitation
54 training strategy can be used as an intervention approach to augment and promote stroke
55 rehabilitation among the rural community-dwelling stroke survivors, especially in SSA.

56 Keywords: Stroke rehabilitation; Self-rehabilitation; Task-specific training; functional ability;
57 community-dwelling stroke survivors; Delphi method.

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71

72

73 **Introduction**

74 Stroke is a substantial source of acquired adult neurological disability worldwide.¹ In low- and
75 middle-income countries (LMICs), stroke incidence has increased alarmingly in the past
76 decade.^{2,3} The consequences of stroke have long-standing effects and require long-term
77 management of the ensuing limitations. Lack of resources, inadequate numbers of rehabilitation
78 professionals, poor awareness, and lack of technical capacity have made the accessibility and
79 availability of stroke rehabilitation services difficult in LMICs, particularly the rural areas of
80 sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).⁴

81 Currently, the needs for stroke rehabilitation are largely unmet. In some regions of LMICs, more
82 than 50% of people do not receive the rehabilitation services they require.⁵ Disturbances
83 including conflicts, disasters and outbreak of infectious diseases create massive surges in
84 rehabilitation needs while also disrupting any available rehabilitation services. The effect of the
85 recent COVID-19 pandemic and its associated physical distancing protocols, and other emerging
86 communicable diseases add up to already existing challenges to stroke rehabilitation delivery in
87 many regions of LMICs.

88 In Nigeria, like in other parts of LMICs, there is no existing intervention strategy to support
89 rehabilitation among rural community-dwelling stroke survivors. Rehabilitation professionals
90 employ the practice of prescribing certain activities termed as ‘home program’ for stroke
91 survivors to run-through at home. These activities are not always task-specific and none has been
92 established through a proper expert consensus approach.

93 The promotion of self-rehabilitation that include task-specific training could be promising in an
94 attempt to address the stroke rehabilitation inadequacies in LMICs. Self-rehabilitation

95 interventions have been shown to improve outcomes post-stroke, lessen the risk of stroke relapse
96 and have encouraging impacts on healthcare resource utilization, which is of great implication
97 for LIMICs.^{6,7,8} Moreover, having the advantage of being run-through in the comfort of an
98 individual's home, self-rehabilitation interventions can easily be accepted by many community-
99 dwelling stroke survivors, and therefore, have the potential to promote wider stroke rehabilitation
100 coverage and drive towards the successful realization of SDG goal number 3 - "Ensuring healthy
101 lives and promoting well-being for all"⁹ and other WHO rehabilitation goals.¹⁰

102 To develop a structured task-specific self-rehabilitation strategy for community-dwelling stroke
103 survivors, a Delphi approach would be more appropriate in order to achieve relevant experts'
104 consensus on the task trainings to be included in the rehabilitation strategy, also the stroke
105 survivors should be consulted in developing the initial task items of the model. In research
106 generally the Delphi method is used to build consensus around a particular research question
107 or topic. Experts are surveyed via questionnaires without being physically assembled.¹¹ A
108 Delphi method is usually used in healthcare when guidelines or treatment protocols need to
109 be developed, and when evidence is limited or inconsistent.¹²

110 The primary objective of this study was to build experts consensus on the appropriate item (task
111 training) to be included in a task-specific self-rehabilitation training strategy that could be
112 administered among Hausa-speaking community-dwelling stroke survivors in Nigeria.

113 **Methods**

114 Ethical approval for this study was sought and obtained from the College Health Research Ethics
115 Committee of Bayero University Kano (ref: NHREC/06/12/19/5). The ACCORD (Accurate
116 Consensus Reporting Document) guideline¹³ was followed in reporting of this study.

117 A two-stage consensus-building approach was adopted in this study; the first stage was the
118 identification of the relevant tasks that could be included on the basis of importance, in a task-
119 specific self-rehabilitation intervention model for improving functional ability among
120 community-dwelling stroke survivors in a resource-limited setting (September-December, 2022).
121 The second stage comprised the conduct of a modified Delphi exercise to build consensus on the
122 final list of task trainings to include in the intervention model (January 2023-January 2024).

123 **Stage 1: Identifying the task training items to include in the intervention model**

124 A list of potential task trainings that could be entered into the intervention model was drawn
125 from information gathered through focus group discussions with stroke survivors. Focus group
126 discussion was used in a previous study to inform the initial content of a Delphi study
127 instrument.¹⁴

128 ***Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)***

129 Five FGDs involving twenty-nine community-dwelling stroke survivors were conducted
130 (between 29th September to 3rd December, 2022), with the aim of identifying the common daily
131 activities that stroke survivors find difficult to accomplish. The inhabitants of the study area are
132 predominantly from Hausa tribe engaged in rice farming.

133 ***FGD: Participants and Sampling Strategy***

134 In order to generate a diverse information with a range of experiences in performing daily
135 activities after stroke, participants were purposefully selected based on gender blend, age, and in
136 diverse locations within the community. Local community contacts and some identified stroke
137 survivors within the community help with participants' recruitment. Consent package which
138 provided details of the study process was fully explained to the prospective participants and their
139 written consent to participate was sought and obtained. All stroke survivors who expressed

140 interest and met the following criteria: aged 18 and above years; diagnosed with ischemic or
141 hemorrhagic stroke; speak and understand the Hausa language; capable of giving informed
142 consent were recruited into the study. Participants were excluded if they have cerebrovascular
143 events due to malignancy or head trauma; have limited comprehension (receptive and/or
144 expressive aphasia); have been diagnosed with other neurological/mental disorder.

145 ***FGDs: procedure***

146 FGD sessions were scheduled with those who gave consent and met the inclusion criteria. Four
147 of the focus groups included 6 participants while one focus group included 5 participants. The
148 discussions took place in a convenient classroom in one of the schools within the Kura town.
149 Using a semi-structured interview guide (S1) which was developed by two members of the
150 research team (IUL and RI), the participants' experiences in performing daily activities after
151 stroke were explored.

152 Discussions were conducted in Hausa language and audio-recorded. Maximum duration of each
153 FGD was 1h and 40 min. The FGDs were facilitated by IUL and field notes were taken by RI.
154 The concept of data saturation and collection of rich and thick data¹⁵ was used to end the data
155 collection.

156 ***FGD: Analysis and results***

157 The audio-recordings were transcribed verbatim and anonymized with codes. The Hausa
158 language transcript was translated into English language at the English language department of
159 Bayero University Kano. Using deductive open coding process, two members of the research
160 team (IUL and RI) agreed on an initial flat coding frame, developed a set of predetermined codes
161 based on the study's objective and both read through the data line-by-line and assigned excerpts to
162 codes until themes were developed.

163 Three major themes and eight sub-themes were identified (table 1). Themes were related to the
164 most commonly reported activities/tasks which stroke survivors struggled to perform and include
165 personal care activities, religious activities and daily participation activities.

166 **Table 1. Themes and sub-themes**

Themes	Sub-themes
Personal care	Feeding Dressing/undressing Washing Bathing
Religious activities	Ablution Praying
Participation	Standing/walking Cooking

167
168 These themes are described below with example of some anonymized quotes.

169 *Personal care*

170 The major activities reported under this theme are categorized into feeding, dressing/undressing
171 and bathing and washing:

172 “..I have no option but to eat with the left hand... I don’t like it, but I have to do it.” (P6).

173 “I eat and drink with the left hand. I use a spoon to eat anything.” (P11).

174 “..Now I use a walking stick to walk to the bathroom...My wife bathes me and wears my
175 clothes for me” (P8).

176 “Wearing trousers is the most difficult for me, so I first wear my shirt even in the
177 bathroom. But I have to go to my bedroom and wear the trousers while seated by the
178 bedside” (P16).

179 “It is always difficult to tie a wrapper around my waist, because I use one hand, so my
180 daughter has to assist me in tying it” (P12).

181 “Whenever I enter the bathroom to bathe myself, I have to rely on the hand that is not
182 affected, and in this manner I just bathe anyhow and come out” (P8).

183 “..I try to bathe myself, but I have to do it slowly and I have to use the left hand to assist
184 the right”. (P20).

185 “to wash my clothes now is very difficult, and there is no one to assist me with that (P2)

186 *Religious activities*

187 The participants were predominantly Muslims and many of them reported having difficulty in
188 performing ablution (sequential washing of some body parts which is a pre-requisite for
189 performing the daily prayers) and praying:

190 “When performing ablution, I have to sit down because I can’t squat down, the leg that
191 supports half of my body is not well” (P7).

192 “In the aspect of performing religious rituals, I am weak, thank God that now I can bend
193 down during prayers, but I can’t prostrate. Also I perform ablution slowly, the person that
194 assists me is also not feeling well now. So somehow I managed to do it, even though my
195 hand is heavy” (P8).

196 “..to perform ablution, someone have to assist me by pouring the water in to my
197 unaffected hand, that’s how I do it” (P4).

198 *Participation activities*

199 Standing/walking and cooking activities were the main activities categorized under this theme:

200 “If I am seated I have to use the right arm to stand up, but I do that slowly. But when I
201 want to walk I have to hold onto something close by...when going out of my house, I
202 have to use the wall as support, because I don’t use a walking stick. But honestly, I don’t
203 go far as I am usually advised to” (P3).

204 “..For example, when I want to stand up to walk, I do that from the right side of the body
205 because it is the stronger side. Just not long ago I fell down while trying to get off a
206 motorcycle, I tried getting down from the left side and place the left leg on the ground
207 first, but it couldn’t carry me and gave way so I fell down...it was frustrating” (P21).

208 “..So sometimes when I have to walk up or down a high surface, if I step up with the
209 affected leg first, I stay still in that position, I cannot proceed. But when I step up with the
210 unaffected leg first, then I can easily follow it with the left one and go up. But I can’t step
211 down” (P9).

212 “..You go out every day to work and earn a living for you and your family, but now I
213 can’t. I rely totally on others to give me...I used to fry groundnuts and sell, but I can’t do
214 that now because of the sickness, I am not able to cook” (P10).

215 *Developing the initial task training items*

216 This was done in two steps; first, the results of the focus group discussions were considered by
217 three physiotherapists (IUL, RI and CJ) with more than 15 years’ experience in stroke
218 rehabilitation. All the tasks that the stroke survivors reported as being difficult were identified.
219 Secondly, the three physiotherapists in collaboration with a kinesiologist isolated and grouped
220 similar tasks based on the pattern of movement and the body part (i.e. upper extremities, lower
221 extremities and the trunk) involved. The training requirements in each group were further

222 categorized based on the activities. This process resulted in the generation of a list of potential
223 tasks (S2) to include in the intervention model which was used in the Delphi exercise.

224 **Stage 2: Consensus-building to select and refine the tasks to include in the intervention** 225 **model**

226 We used a modified Delphi technique¹⁶ to build consensus on which tasks generated from stage
227 1 were relevant to include in the intervention model. Three rounds of rating and review by an
228 expert panel were conducted over an eleven-month period.

229 *Selection of panelists*

230 Using purposive sampling technique, thirty stroke rehabilitation experts (comprising of ten from
231 Nigeria, ten from other parts of Africa and ten from other parts of the world) from diverse
232 professional groups involved in stroke rehabilitation, with at least 15 years of experience in
233 stroke management were contacted through email for their consent (S3) to participate in the
234 Delphi process.

235 Potential panelists were identified through their published work in the field of stroke
236 rehabilitation and some suggested by the main study team. These potential panelists were also
237 asked to suggest others who they consider suitable to participate (snowball sampling), and were
238 also invited, provided they met the inclusion criteria. Our aim was to achieve a panel of 11 to 30
239 panelists, which is a range of sample size regarded as effective and reliable for a Delphi
240 technique.^{17,18} A copy of the set of tasks including an instruction note (S4) on how to rate the of
241 items was sent to each of those who provided signed written consent. All correspondence with
242 the panelists was done via e-mail.

243 *Defining consensus*

244 A consensus on a topic or an issue can be regarded as the general agreement among a group of
245 people that are well informed (experts) about the topic or issue in question. In the literature,
246 consensus was defined as the “gathering of individual evaluations around a median response
247 with minimal divergence.”^{19,20} While experts can reach 100% agreement on only a few issues,²¹
248 however, consensus is determined by a certain percentage of experts who agree to an issue in a
249 Delphi survey, and this should be defined and stated before the conduct of the survey.²²

250 The level of consensus on what task training is relevant was measured at the end of first and
251 second rounds in this study, while the final level of consensus on the overall suitability of the
252 intervention model was measured at the end of the third round. The level of consensus on the
253 relevance of each task training was determined as follows: for each task training, the number of
254 experts giving a rating of 3 or 4 divided by the total number of experts was computed. Consensus
255 was decided to be accomplished if a task training would receive a score of ≥ 0.78 .²³ Any task
256 training that scored < 0.78 was either modified for the next round or removed. For the overall
257 suitability of the intervention model, the level of consensus was determined as follows: The
258 proportion of items giving a rating of 3 or 4 by raters involved was computed as advocated by
259 Waltz and Bausell.²⁴ A score of ≥ 0.8 would be accepted as moderate to high consensus based on
260 available procedural evidence.^{25,26,27,21}

261 ***Delphi round 1***

262 In this round the panelists rate each item of the model in terms of its relevance to the underlying
263 construct. The item ratings were on a 4- point scale to avoid a neutral and ambivalent midpoint²³
264 and to produce stable findings in Delphi studies.¹⁸ The rating interpretation was as follows: 1 =
265 not relevant, 2 = somewhat relevant, 3 = quite relevant and 4 = highly relevant. After all the
266 panelists have finished the ratings, the package was retrieved and the computation to determine

267 consensus on the item relevance was done. Items that were not rated by at least two-third of the
268 panelists were not included in the computation and were regarded as items on which no
269 consensus was reached and were included in the next round.

270 For each task item, options for the panelists to provide text comments in support of their rating,
271 reason for abstaining from rating or to suggest changes to the task were available. The panelists
272 were given a period of three weeks to respond and reminders were sent on a weekly basis.

273 *Delphi round 2*

274 In this round, the written opinion of all the panelist were summarized and shared among them.
275 Experts were invited to consider their scores for the remaining task trainings that did not make
276 the required item validity score and were not removed, based on group responses in relation to
277 the overall responses received. They decided/suggested what they deemed appropriate between
278 their rating and the average opinion of other respondents. Additionally, further explanation of
279 some culture-based tasks was done to the panelists, particularly, those who were not familiar
280 with the culture of the intervention target population. Panelists were also asked to give written
281 opinions (S5) on the overall structure and inclusiveness of the included tasks. The item rating
282 and validity score computation was as in round 1.

283 Prior to the commencement of the third round, an in-person meeting of the study team was held,
284 purposely, to decide on some tasks which are peculiar to the culture of the study area and that
285 some panelists were not familiar with, and as a result abstained from rating those tasks. The
286 study team also, finalized the structure and inclusiveness of the task training items in the model
287 by considering the comments from the panelists in round 2. All items that had the required score

288 and no suggestions were made about them by the panelists, were not debated in the meeting and
289 panel consensus was deemed final.

290 *Delphi round 3*

291 Round 3 involves the content validation of the task training items in the model (including those
292 that have been retained in round 1 and 2, and those modified or added during the in-person study
293 team meeting. In this round, panelists were invited to reassess the content and rate the whole
294 model using the criteria in round 1. All responses were collected individually.

295 **Data analysis**

296 Analysis of data was done using Microsoft Excel and involved calculating the proportions of
297 agreement. For first and second rounds of the Delphi, the number of experts giving a rating of 3
298 or 4 (for each task training) divided by the total number of experts was computed. A score of \geq
299 0.78 indicates consensus has been reached to keep the task training.²³

300 For the third round of the Delphi, the average proportion of task training items giving a rating of
301 3 or 4 by raters involved was computed as advocated by Waltz and Bausell.²⁴ Based on available
302 procedural evidence, a content validity score of ≥ 0.8 was deemed consensus to keep the content
303 of the intervention strategy.^{25,26,27}

304 **Results**

305 **Stage 1: Identifying the task training items to be included in the intervention model**

306 Seventy-four (74) task training items (S2) were drawn and designed based on the information
307 gathered through focus group discussions with stroke survivors, as potential items for the stroke
308 self-rehabilitation model. Thirty-seven (37) task trainings were grouped as training for the upper
309 extremity, 21 tasks were grouped under the lower extremity training, while 7 and 9 tasks were

310 grouped under the trunk and balance training respectively. We further categorized the groups
 311 based on the activities involved (table 2).

312 **Table 2. Initial Grouping/categorization and number of the task training items**

Task training group	Category	No of task training items
Upper extremity training	Trainings for reaching	13
	Trainings for grasp/grip	4
	Trainings for moving objects	6
	Trainings for object manipulation	10
	Trainings for hand/fingers precision	4
Group total		37
Lower extremity training	Training for transfers from sit to stand	9
	Training for maintaining standing	4
	Training for reaching in standing	3
	Training for stepping and walking	5
Group total		21
Trunk training	Training for trunk strength in sitting	4
	Training for trunk strength in lying position	3
Group total		7
Training for balance	Training for balance in sitting	3
	Training for balance in standing	6
Group total		9
Total task training items		74

313
 314
 315 **Stage 2: Consensus-building to select and refine the tasks to include in the intervention**
 316 **model**
 317 Forty-five experts who met the selection criteria were invited. Eighteen panelists consented to
 318 participate, of whom 13 (72%) completed the 3 rounds of the Delphi study (Table 3). The Delphi

319 technique took almost a year (January 2023-January 2024) to complete due to delays in response
320 from the panel lists.

321 **Table 3. Demographic characteristics of the panelists**

Panelists (n = 13)	
Gender	
Male	6 (46.2%)
Female	7 (53.8%)
Country of residence	
Nigeria	7 (53.8%)
South Africa	4 (30.8%)
Iran	1 (7.7%)
Thailand	1 (7.7%)
Experience in stroke rehabilitation	
Mean number of years	22 years

322
323 At the end of Delphi round one (S6), 28 (38%) items of the intervention model achieved item
324 validity scores of ≥ 0.78 and were retained. Four of the items received a score of less than ≤ 2 by
325 all the panelists and these items were removed. The remaining 42 items were amended based on
326 the comments and suggestions by the panelists (S5) and re-entered into round two (S7). At the
327 end of the second round, 7 (17%) of the items achieved item validity scores of ≥ 0.78 and were
328 retained.

329 Thus at the end of the second round, 35 (47%) of the 74 task trainings met the predefined item
330 validity score of ≥ 0.78 and 4 (5%) were removed. The remaining 35 items were considered at
331 the study team meeting. The team (RI, IUL, UMB, AA and one Delphi panelist) agreed on the
332 removal of all 25 items proposed as meriting removal, and 10 items modified as warm up
333 exercises and 4 new task trainings were added, based on the comments and suggestions (S5)
334 made by the panelists in both the previous rounds of the Delphi. Fourteen training tasks were the

335 items added to the already retained 35 items and entered in to round three (S8) for content
336 validation. Figure 1 shows the flow of participants and items through the stages of the study.

337

338 **Fig 1 Flow of the consensus-building process**

339

340 At the end of round three a mean content validity score of 0.93 (table 4) was achieved and
341 therefore all the fourteen items from the team meeting were retained.

342 **Table 4. The proportion of items giving a rating of 3 or 4 by raters involved in round 3**

Rater	Score
P1	0.79
P2	1.00
P3	0.92
P4	0.95
P5	0.89
P6	0.95
P7	0.97
P8	0.97
P9	0.97
P10	0.97
P11	0.82
P12	0.92
P13	1.00
Mean core	0.93

343

344 The number of items in each category through the stages of the study is shown in Table 5. Thus
345 at the end of round three consensus was reached to retain 49 (66%) task trainings (table 6) of
346 which 10 were retained as warm up exercises (S9).

347 **Table 5. Number (%) of items in each category through the stages of the study**

Stage 1 Group	Stage 2 Category	Round 1		Round 2		Study team meeting				Round 3		Final no. of items in each category
		No. of items	Items to keep	No. of items	Items to keep	No. of items	Items removed	Items modified	Items added	No. of items	Items to keep	
Upper extremity training	Reaching in sitting	13	4 (31%)	5	0 (0%)	5	5	0	0	4	4	4
	Grasp/grip*	4	2 (50%)	2	0 (0%)	2	1	1	0	3	3	3
	Moving objects*	6	3 (50%)	3	0 (0%)	3	1	2	0	5	5	5
	Objects manipulation	10	4 (40%)	6	3 (50%)	3	0	3	0	10	10	10
Lower extremity training [‡]	Hand/fingers precision	4	4 (100%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0		1	5	5	5
	Sit to stand	9	2 (22%)	7	0 (0%)	7	4	4	0	6	6	6
	Maintaining standing [∞]	4	1 (25%)	3	0 (0%)	3	3	0	0	1	1	1
	Reaching in standing [∞]	3	1 (33%)	2	0 (0%)	2	2	0	0	1	1	1
	Stepping and walking	5	3 (60%)	2	1 (50%)	1	1	0	0	4	4	4
Training for trunk	Trunk strength in sitting [¶]	4	3 (75%)	1	0 (0%)	1	1	0	2	5	5	5
	Trunk strength in lying [¶]	3	1 (33%)	2	0 (0%)	2	2	0	0	1	1	1
Balance	Maintaining	3	0 (0%)	3	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	2

training [¥]	balance in sitting				(33%)									
	Maintaining balance in standing	6	0 (0%)	6	2 (33%)	4	4	0	0	2	2	2		
Total		74	28 (38%)	42	7 (17%)	35	25	10	4	49	49 (100%)	49 (66% of 74)		

348 Note: *grasp/grip and moving objects categories were merged; [∞] maintaining and reaching in standing merged together; [¥] lower extremity and balance
349 training groups were merged; [¶] trainings for trunk strength in sitting and in lying were merged in to one category.

350 **Table 6. Final grouping/categorization of items in the model**

Task training group	Category	No of task training
Upper extremity training	Warm up	5
	Training for reaching	4
	Training for grasp/grip and moving objects	8
	Trainings for object manipulation	10
	Training for hand/fingers precision	5
Group total		32
Lower extremity and balance training	Warm up	2
	Training for transfers from sit to stand	2
	Training for maintaining standing and reaching in standing	2
	Training for stepping and walking	4
Group total		10
Training for trunk strength	Warm up	3
	Training for trunk strength in sitting and lying position	4
Group total		7
Total task training		49

351

352 **Task-specificity of the items**

353 The text responses of the panelists emphasized the importance of making the items of the model

354 to be task-specific training. As a result, items that comprise activities not task-specific received

355 low ratings. The need for warm-up exercises prior to the commencement of the main training

356 was also among the suggestions made by the panelists. In the response to these comments and

357 suggestions, the study team decided to retain those items comprising of non-task-specific

358 activities as warm- up exercises, and this decision was unanimously agreed by the panelists in

359 the final round of the Delphi. Ten items of the model were converted to warm- up exercises: five

360 for upper extremity training group; two for lower extremity and balance training group; and three
361 for the trunk training group.

362 **Redundant and similar items**

363 The panel highlighted the issue of repetition of items within and outside categories. Redundancy
364 and similarities were the major terms used by the panelists when describing such items, the
365 panelists suggested merging some task trainings together, it was argued and agreed by the
366 panelists that most of the items in the lower extremity training group were similar to those in the
367 balance training group and can be used to improve both lower extremity and balance functions,
368 and consequently the lower extremity and balance training groups were merged as one training
369 group. The following categories were merged based on the panelists' suggestions: grasp/grip and
370 moving objects; maintaining and reaching in standing; training for trunk strength in sitting and in
371 lying. These merging were undertaken during the study team meeting.

372 **Non familiar item**

373 Some items involve activities that are peculiar to the culture of the target population and
374 therefore, were not clear to some panelists which prompted them to suggest that “use of pictures
375 for these activities would help because it takes time to figure out what is expected.” Thus, picture
376 demonstration of such activities involving the use of Hausa local cap, eating bowl, and ablution
377 related activities were included in the second round of the Delphi. This resulted in better
378 understanding and facilitated the rating of the items by the panelists.

379

380

381 **Discussion**

382 This article presents a consensus-building study aimed at identifying the relevant and suitable
383 items (task trainings) of a Task-specific Self-Rehabilitation Training (TASSRET) intervention
384 model for improving functional ability outcomes among rural community-dwelling stroke
385 survivors. The outcome is a list of 39 task-specific training and 10 warm up exercises, which can
386 be self-administered at home using common household items that are peculiar to the target
387 population. Due to the limited economic resources of health care systems in developing
388 countries, the emergence of new and expensive technologies has been restricted to developed
389 countries.⁴ The existence of such innovative and inexpensive stroke intervention approaches
390 would greatly benefit stroke rehabilitation particularly in developing countries.⁸

391 This Task-specific Self-Rehabilitation Training (TASSRET) is a product of combined input from
392 the rural community-dwelling stroke survivors and the expertise of 13 stroke rehabilitation
393 professionals with adequate clinical experience and cumulative learning. The results of this study
394 may augment the poor stroke rehabilitation services as well as promote stroke rehabilitation in
395 rural communities, particularly in the SSA. Rehabilitation is an essential part of universal health
396 coverage and is a key strategy for achieving Sustainable Development Goal 3 – “Ensure healthy
397 lives and promote well-being for all at all ages.”⁹ The TASSRET model may promote
398 inclusiveness and coverage of rehabilitation services by providing the opportunity of self-
399 rehabilitation among rural community-dwelling stroke survivors (including the unlettered) within
400 the comfort of their homes.

401 This study has some strengths and limitations. The source of the initial list of candidate features
402 for entry into the first round of the Delphi was through focus group discussion with stroke
403 survivors. This is recommended as a valid source of appropriate items to inform the first

404 quantitative round of a Delphi survey.²⁸ Several rounds of written detailed information were sent
405 to panelists to ensure that the panelists have an understanding of the study's aim and process, and
406 this helps build good research relationships between researchers and panelists.²⁹ Moreover,
407 reminder emails and sometimes phone calls, were employed to enhance time and rate of
408 response. Nonetheless, the response was at times poor.

409 A further strength of this study was the administrative skills employed in coding system for
410 tracking panelists and their responses through the Delphi rounds. Analyzing changes of opinion
411 and suggestions was undertaken and managed well. These are issues upon which the smooth
412 execution of a Delphi is based, but are scarcely considered in the literature.²⁸

413 Some of the limitations of this study include the identification of the potential panelists, as the
414 contacts of the potential panelists were obtained through their published papers and in many
415 instances the addresses were obsolete. Also, the study team made an input into the modification
416 of some items prior to the commencement of the final round of the Delphi. Although it was done
417 based on the responses of the panelists, this goes against the basic tenets of the Delphi method.
418 The input from the research team was deemed necessary as it was difficult to progress without
419 doing so. This was similarly noted by Green et al in the Delphi study of general practitioners'
420 information requirements, in which the study team reordered and reduced the information
421 generated.³⁰

422 Another limitation was in the pursuit of true anonymity. In order to achieve maximum response,
423 the identity of some of the panelists was known to the research team, this helped in persuading
424 panelists that responded late, however, we ensured that the panelists and their responses
425 remained strictly anonymous to the rest of the panel.

426 **Conclusion**

427 This Task-specific Self-Rehabilitation Training model can be used as an intervention approach to
428 augment and promote stroke rehabilitation among rural community-dwelling stroke survivors,
429 especially in SSA. Further work may be needed to improve and determine the effectiveness of
430 this intervention program in improving functional ability outcomes post-stroke.

431

432 **Acknowledgments**

433 We appreciate the National Assembly, Abuja, Bayero University Kano and Skyline University
434 Kano, Nigeria for providing the enabling environment for the writing and submission of this
435 manuscript.

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445 **References**

- 446 1. Langhorne P, Bernhardt J, Kwakkel G. Stroke rehabilitation. *Lancet*. 2011; 377(9778):
447 1693–1702. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60325-5
- 448 2. Feigin VL, Forouzanfar MH, Krishnamurthi R, et al. Global and regional burden of
449 stroke during 1990–2010: findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010.
450 *Lancet*. 2014; 383(9913):245–255. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)61953-4
- 451 3. Johnson W, Onuma O, Owolabi M, Sachdev S. Stroke: a global response is needed. *Bull*
452 *World Health Organ*. 2016; 94:634-634A. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.16.181636>
- 453 4. Tawa N, Rhoda A, Brink Y, et al. Stroke rehabilitation services in Africa – Challenges
454 and opportunities: A scoping review of the literature. In: Louw Q, editor. Collaborative
455 capacity development to complement stroke rehabilitation in Africa [Internet]. Cape
456 Town (ZA): AOSIS; 2020. Chapter 1. Available from:
457 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK574231/> doi: 10.4102/aosis.2020.BK85.01
- 458 5. Neill R, Shawar YR, Ashraf L, et al. Prioritizing rehabilitation in low- and middle-
459 income country national health systems: a qualitative thematic synthesis and development
460 of a policy framework. *Int J Equity Health* **22**, 91 (2023). [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-023-01896-5)
461 023-01896-5
- 462 6. Yan LL, Li C, Chen J, Miranda JJ, et al. Prevention, management, and rehabilitation of
463 stroke in low- and middle-income countries. *eNeurological Sci*. 2016 Mar 2;2:21-30. doi:
464 10.1016/j.ensci.2016.02.011. PMID: 29473058; PMCID: PMC5818135.
- 465 7. Lennon S, McKenna S, Jones F. Self-management programmes for people post stroke: a
466 systematic review. *Clin Rehabil*. 2013 Oct;27(10):867-78. doi:
467 10.1177/0269215513481045. Epub 2013 Mar 29. PMID: 23543340.

- 468 8. Niama Natta DD, Lejeune T, Detrembleur C, Yarou B, Sogbossi ES, Alagnidé E,
469 Kpadonou T, Selves C, Stoquart G. Effectiveness of a self-rehabilitation program to
470 improve upper-extremity function after stroke in developing countries: A randomized
471 controlled trial. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2021 Jan;64(1):101413. doi:
472 10.1016/j.rehab.2020.03.017. Epub 2020 Oct 15. PMID: 32619630.
- 473 9. UN General Assembly. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable
474 Development, 21 October 2015, A/RES/70/1,
475 <https://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html> [accessed 6 August 2023]
- 476 10. WHO. Rehabilitation Goals 2030, <https://www.who.int/initiatives/rehabilitation-2030>
477 [accessed 6 August 2023].
- 478 11. de Villiers MR, de Villiers PJ, Kent AP. The Delphi technique in health sciences
479 education research. *Med Teach*. 2005 Nov; 27(7):639-43. doi:
480 10.1080/13611260500069947. PMID: 16332558
- 481 12. The Center for Health Design, 2017; Taylor, Joseph, Quan, & Nanda, 2014
- 482 13. Gattrell WT, Logullo P, van Zuuren EJ, Price A, Hughes EL, Blazey P, Winchester CC,
483 Tovey D, Goldman K, Hungin AP, Harrison N. ACCORD (ACcurate COnsensus
484 Reporting Document): A reporting guideline for consensus methods in biomedicine
485 developed via a modified Delphi. *PLoS Med*. 2024 Jan 23;21(1):e1004326. doi:
486 10.1371/journal.pmed.1004326. PMID: 38261576; PMCID: PMC10805282.
- 487 14. Steward IP, Young ES, Dogra SA, Stamp E, Daly-Smith A, Siddique K, Morgan K,
488 Crowther J, Hall J; JU:MP research & development team. How to develop young
489 physical activity leaders? A Delphi study. *PLoS One*. 2023 Sep 29;18(9):e0286920. doi:
490 10.1371/journal.pone.0286920. PMID: 37773961; PMCID: PMC10540972.

- 491 15. LeCompte MD, Schensul JJ. Designing and conducting ethnographic research: an
492 introduction. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press; 2010.
- 493 16. Jones J, Hunter D. Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *BMJ*.
494 1995;311(7001):376-380. doi:10.1136/bmj.311.7001.376
- 495 17. Dalkey NC. The Delphi method: an experimental study of group opinion. Santa Monica,
496 CA: RAND Corporation; 1969. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_memoranda/RM5888.html)
497 [research_memoranda/RM5888.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_memoranda/RM5888.html).
- 498 18. Akins RB, Tolson H, Cole BR. Stability of response characteristics of a Delphi panel:
499 application of bootstrap data expansion. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2005;5:37. Published
500 2005 Dec 1. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-5-37
- 501 19. Keenyey S, Hasson F, McKenna H. The Delphi Technique in Nursing and Health
502 Research. A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication; 2011. 1–210 p
- 503 20. Ross S, Metcalf A, Bulger SM, Housner LD. Modified delphi investigation of motor
504 development and learning in physical education teacher education. *Res Q Exerc Sport*
505 [Internet]. 2014; 85(3):316–29. Available from:
506 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2014.930087> PMID: 25141085
- 507 21. Mubarak N, Hatah E, Aris MAM, Shafie AA, Zin CS. Consensus among healthcare
508 stakeholders on a collaborative medication therapy management model for chronic
509 diseases in Malaysia; A Delphi study. *PLoS One*. 2019 May 10;14(5):e0216563. doi:
510 10.1371/journal.pone.0216563. PMID: 31075110; PMCID: PMC6510413.
- 511 22. Li Y, Ehiri J, Hu D, Zhang Y, Wang Q, Zhang S, et al. Framework of behavioral
512 indicators for outcome evaluation of TB health promotion: A Delphi study of TB
513 suspects and Tb patients. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2014; 14(1):1–14

- 514 23. Lynn MR. Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nurs Res.*
515 1986;35(6):382-385.
- 516 24. Waltz CF, Bausell RB. Nursing research; Design, statistics, and computer analysis.
517 Philadelphia: F. A. Davis; 1981.
- 518 25. Davis LL. Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nurs*
519 *Res.* 1992 Nov;5(4):194–7. doi:10.1016/s0897-1897(05)80008-4.
- 520 26. Grant JS, Davis LL. Selection and use of content experts for instrument development.
521 *Res Nurs Health.* 1997 Jun;20(3):269-74. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1098-
522 240x(199706)20:3<269::aid-nur9>3.0.co;2-g. PMID: 9179180.
- 523 27. Polit D, Beck C. Nursing research: Principles and methods. 7th ed. Philadelphia:
524 Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins; 2004.
- 525 28. Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *J*
526 *Adv Nurs.* 2000 Oct;32(4):1008-15. PMID: 11095242.
- 527 29. Whitman NI. The committee meeting alternative. Using the Delphi technique. *J Nurs*
528 *Adm.* 1990 Jul-Aug;20(7-8):30-6. PMID: 2199631.
- 529 30. Green B, Jones M, Hughes D, Williams A. Applying the Delphi technique in a study of
530 GPs' information requirements. *Health Soc Care Community.* 1999 May;7(3):198-205.
531 doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2524.1999.00176.x. PMID: 11560634.

532

533 **Supporting information**

534 S1: FGD interview guide

535 S2: Initial task trainings

536 S3: Delphi invitation and consent letter

537 S4: Delphi instruction note

538 S5: Panelists' comments and suggestions

539 S6: Delphi round 1

540 S7: Delphi round 2

541 S8: Delphi round 3

542 S9: Final task trainings (TASSRET)

543

544

545

546