



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Hilari, K., Behn, N., James, K., Northcott, S., Marshall, J., Thomas, S., Simpson, A., Moss, B., Flood, C., McVicker, S. & et al (2021). Supporting wellbeing through peer-befriending (SUPERB) for people with aphasia: A feasibility randomised controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 35(8), pp. 1151-1163. doi: 10.1177/0269215521995671

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/25770/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215521995671>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Figure I- Peer befriender flow diagram detailing recruitment and contribution to the intervention






Figure 2- Standardised treatment effects (a) at 4 months, (b) at 10 months.

(a)



(b)



Effect sizes show Peer vs Usual A lower score shows a clinical improvement on the GHQ-12, DISCS and Friendship scale. A higher score shows a clinical improvement on the SWEMWBS, CPIB, CIQ and CCRSA. GHQ: General Health Questionnaire, DISCS: Depression Intensity Scale Circles, CPIB: Communication Participation Item Bank, CIQ: Community Integration Questionnaire, SWEMWBS: Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale, CCRSA: Communication Confidence Rating Scale for Aphasia.

Table I: Personal history characteristics for significant others at baseline, 4- and 10-month follow-up (to determine potential changes during the course of the study)

Personal history variables for significant others		Baseline			4 months			10 months		
		Usual N=24 N (%)	Peer N=24 N (%)	Overall N=48 N (%)	Usual N=23 N (%)	Peer N=24 N (%)	Overall N=47 N (%)	Usual N=22 N (%)	Peer N=23 N (%)	Overall N=45 N (%)
Is the significant other the participant's main carer?	<i>No</i>	6 (25.0)	5 (20.8)	11 (22.9)	6 (26.1)	4 (16.7)	10 (21.3)	5 (22.7)	4 (17.4)	9 (20.0)
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (75.0)	19 (79.2)	37 (77.1)	15 (65.2)	18 (75.0)	33 (70.2)	15 (68.2)	16 (69.6)	31 (68.9)
	<i>Missing</i>	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	2 (8.3)	4 (8.5)	2 (9.1)	3 (13.0)	5 (11.1)
Marital status	<i>Single</i>	8 (33.3)	9 (37.5)	17 (35.4)	6 (26.1)	8 (33.3)	14 (29.8)	6 (27.3)	8 (34.8)	14 (31.1)
	<i>Married</i>	12 (50.0)	11 (45.8)	23 (47.9)	12 (52.2)	11 (45.8)	23 (48.9)	11 (50.0)	9 (39.1)	20 (44.4)
	<i>Has partner</i>	1 (4.2)	3 (12.5)	4 (8.3)	1 (4.3)	2 (8.3)	3 (6.4)	1 (4.5)	2 (8.7)	3 (6.7)
	<i>Widowed</i>	2 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.2)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.1)	1 (4.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.2)
	<i>Divorced</i>	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)	2 (4.2)	1 (4.3)	1 (4.2)	2 (4.3)	1 (4.5)	1 (4.3)	2 (4.4)
	<i>Missing</i>	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	2 (8.3)	4 (8.5)	2 (9.1)	3 (13.0)	5 (11.1)
Work situation	<i>Full-time paid work</i>	8 (33.3)	9 (37.5)	17 (35.4)	4 (17.4)	7 (29.2)	11 (23.4)	3 (13.6)	6 (26.1)	9 (20.0)
	<i>Part-time paid work</i>	4 (16.7)	2 (8.3)	6 (12.5)	4 (17.4)	2 (8.3)	6 (12.8)	4 (18.2)	1 (4.3)	5 (11.1)
	<i>Volunteer work</i>	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.2)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	1 (2.2)
	<i>Retired prior to stroke</i>	9 (37.5)	11 (45.8)	20 (41.7)	9 (39.1)	10 (41.7)	19 (40.4)	10 (45.5)	10 (43.5)	20 (44.4)
	<i>Looking after home</i>	2 (8.3)	2 (8.3)	4 (8.3)	4 (17.4)	2 (8.3)	6 (12.8)	3 (13.6)	2 (8.7)	5 (11.1)
	<i>Unemployed</i>	1 (4.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	<i>Missing</i>	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	2 (8.3)	4 (8.5)	2 (9.1)	3 (13.0)	5 (11.1)
Work pattern changed	<i>No</i>	16 (66.7)	18 (75.0)	34 (70.8)	17 (73.9)	16 (66.7)	33 (70.2)	16 (72.7)	18 (78.3)	34 (75.6)
	<i>Yes - stopped working</i>	1 (4.2)	2 (8.3)	3 (6.3)	1 (4.3)	2 (8.3)	3 (6.4)	1 (4.5)	1 (4.3)	2 (4.4)
	<i>Yes - reduced hours of work</i>	7 (29.2)	3 (12.5)	10 (20.8)	3 (13.0)	2 (8.3)	5 (10.6)	3 (13.6)	0 (0.0)	3 (6.7)
	<i>Yes - increased hours of work</i>	0 (0.0)	1 (4.2)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.3)	2 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	1 (2.2)
	<i>Missing</i>	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	2 (8.3)	4 (8.5)	2 (9.1)	3 (13.0)	5 (11.1)

Table II: Personal history characteristics for peer-befrienders, before and after peer-befriending (to determine potential changes during the course of the study)

Personal history characteristics for peer-befrienders		Before befriending all N=12 N (%)	Before befriending in study N=10 N (%)	After befriending N=10 N (%)
Marital status	<i>Single</i>	3 (25.0)	3 (30.0)	5 (50.0)
	<i>Married</i>	1 (8.3)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)
	<i>Has partner</i>	7 (58.3)	5 (50.0)	3 (30.0)
	<i>Divorced</i>	1 (8.3)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)
Employment	<i>Part-time paid work</i>	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)
	<i>Volunteer work</i>	5 (41.7)	5 (50.0)	5 (50.0)
	<i>Retired prior to stroke</i>	1 (8.3)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)
	<i>Retired because of stroke</i>	1 (8.3)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)
	<i>Unemployed</i>	5 (41.7)	3 (30.0)	2 (20.0)
Work prior to stroke*	<i>Full-time paid work</i>	9 (75.0)	7 (70.0)	.
	<i>Part-time paid work</i>	2 (16.7)	2 (20.0)	.
	<i>Retired prior to stroke</i>	1 (8.3)	1 (10.0)	.
Socioeconomic class*	<i>Higher managerial, administrative and professional</i>	3 (25.0)	3 (30.0)	.
	<i>Intermediate occupations</i>	5 (41.7)	4 (40.0)	.
	<i>Routine and manual occupations</i>	4 (33.3)	3 (30.0)	.
Education*	<i>Did not finish school</i>	3 (25.0)	2 (20.0)	.
	<i>Finished school</i>	3 (25.0)	2 (20.0)	.
	<i>Further education qualification (not university)</i>	4 (33.3)	4 (40.0)	.
	<i>University degree</i>	2 (16.7)	2 (20.0)	.
Able to use public transport	<i>Yes</i>	12 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	10 (100.0)
Able to drive	<i>No</i>	7 (58.3)	6 (60.0)	6 (60.0)
	<i>Yes</i>	5 (41.7)	4 (40.0)	4 (40.0)
Able to keep going for 3-4 hours	<i>No</i>	1 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (91.7)	10 (100.0)	10 (100.0)
If no, for how long can you?	<i>2-3 hours</i>	1 (100.0)	0 (.)	0 (.)

* Data not collected after befriending as variables relate to pre-stroke and cannot change.

Table III: Estimated differences between Peer and Usual arms for the per-protocol population

	4 months		10 months	
	Estimate	Confidence Interval	Estimate	Confidence Interval
General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12)	-0.13	[-1.65, 1.39]	-1.25	[-2.74, 0.24]
GHQ-12 categorical (odds ratio)	0.96	[0.11, 8.09]	0.05	[0.002, 1.02]
Depression Intensity Scale Circles	0.29	[-0.34, 0.91]	-0.17	[-0.79, 0.44]
Friendship scale	0.51	[-2.09, 3.11]	0.05	[-2.52, 2.62]
Communication Participation Item Bank	2.77	[-0.96, 6.49]	3.33	[-0.35, 7.00]
Community Integration Questionnaire	-1.80	[-3.57, -0.04]	-1.86	[-3.59, -0.13]
Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale	-0.03	[-2.66, 2.60]	0.23	[-2.35, 2.82]
Communication Confidence Rating Scale for Aphasia	-0.22	[-3.17, 2.72]	0.18	[-2.73, 3.10]

Estimates represent point differences on the scales between Peer and Usual arms after adjusting for baseline scores. A lower score shows a clinical improvement on the GHQ-12, Depression Intensity Scale Circles and Friendship scale. A higher score shows a clinical improvement on the Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale, Communication Participation Item Bank, Community Integration Questionnaire and Communication Confidence Rating Scale for Aphasia.

Table IV: Standardised effect sizes for the intention-to-treat population

	4 months		10 months	
	Effect size	Confidence Interval	Effect size	Confidence Interval
General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12)	-0.19	[-0.57, 0.20]	-0.34	[-0.73, 0.05]
Depression Intensity Scale Circles	0.14	[-0.30, 0.58]	-0.13	[-0.57, 0.31]
Friendship scale	-0.21	[-0.63, 0.21]	-0.11	[-0.53, 0.31]
Communication Participation Item Bank	0.19	[-0.29, 0.66]	0.30	[-0.17, 0.78]
Community Integration Questionnaire	-0.30	[-0.58, -0.03]	-0.27	[-0.55, 0.01]
Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale	0.18	[-0.29, 0.64]	-0.12	[-0.58, 0.35]
Communication Confidence Rating Scale for Aphasia	-0.03	[-0.42, 0.36]	-0.03	[-0.42, 0.36]

Legend: All presented effect sizes show arm Peer vs arm Usual. A lower score shows a clinical improvement on the GHQ-12, Depression Intensity Scale Circles and Friendship scale. A higher score shows a clinical improvement on the Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale, Communication Participation Item Bank, Community Integration Questionnaire and Communication Confidence Rating Scale for Aphasia.

Table V: Estimated differences between Peer and Usual for significant others.

	4 months		10 months	
	Estimate	Confidence Interval	Estimate	Confidence Interval
General Health Questionnaire-28	-0.04	[-2.73, 2.66]	1.31	[-1.49, 4.12]
Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale	1.28	[-1.08, 3.64]	0.67	[-1.76, 3.11]
Bakas Caregiving Outcome Scale	-0.97	[-8.35, 6.41]	-2.53	[-10.13, 5.06]

Estimates represent point differences on the scales between Peer and Usual arms after adjusting for baseline scores. A lower score for the General Health Questionnaire-28 indicates a clinical improvement whereas a higher score indicates clinical improvement for the Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale and the Bakas Caregiving Outcome Scale.

Table VI: Peer befriender outcomes

	Mean difference	Confidence interval
Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale	-2.3	[-6.97, 2.37]
Generalised Self-Efficacy	0.1	[-3.59, 3.79]
Community Integration Questionnaire	0	[-1.97, 1.97]

Mean differences were calculated by comparing pre and post time (post minus pre) point scores for the peer befrienders whose data was collected before and after completion of peer-befriending.