



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

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.

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

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

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. 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.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

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.