

Est.  
1841

YORK  
ST JOHN  
UNIVERSITY

Mayhew E, E., Beresford B, B., Laver Fawcett, Alison ORCID logo ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9924-1319>, Aspinal, F., Mann, R., Bechtold, K. and Kanaan, M. (2019) The Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale - Reablement Version (HRERS-RV): Development and Psychometric Properties. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 27 (3). pp. 777-787.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/3610/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/hsc.12696>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at [ray@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorks.ac.uk)



**The Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale -  
Reablement Version (HRERS-RV): Development and  
Psychometric Properties**

Journal:	<i>Health &amp; Social Care in the Community</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	reablement, Patient Engagement, Social Care, Older People, outcomes

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Peer Review

## Abstract

Patient or user engagement with health and social care interventions is receiving increased attention and interest within practice settings and research. An English evaluation of three reablement services wished to include a measure of user-engagement so as to explore its association with outcomes. As no measure of reablement engagement existed, an existing measure designed for use with physical rehabilitation patients (the Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale) was adapted and its psychometric properties tested. The adapted version was completed by reablement staff at the time an individual (n=129) was discharged from one of the three reablement services. Outcomes data (Barthel Index, Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living Scale, General Health Questionnaire-12) collected by the evaluation study at baseline (that is, at entry into reablement), discharge and 6 months post-discharge was used for some psychometric testing. Internal consistency and construct, predictive and discriminant validity were investigated. The adapted scale measured a single construct and had good internal consistency. Tests of predictive and discriminant validity were positive. Findings from a separate, small-scale (n=31) test – retest study offer an early indication that this is acceptable. There was, however, evidence of a ceiling effect and we consider ways this may be ameliorated. The Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale – Reablement Version offers a means by which user engagement in reablement can be measured using a staff-completed instrument. The association between engagement and reablement outcomes, revealed when testing for predictive validity, supports the argument for greater attention and investment in research on user engagement in reablement. More broadly, researching engagement within the context of an intervention often delivered by multiple practitioners offers the opportunity to further understand this concept which, in

1  
2  
3 the past, has particularly focused on interventions delivered by a single practitioner. In  
4  
5 addition, future work should include developing a companion measure completed by  
6  
7 service users.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 **Keywords:** reablement, engagement, social care, older people, outcomes  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 **What is known about this topic?**  
22

- 23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41
- For some healthcare interventions, there is good evidence that patient engagement impacts on outcomes.
  - Qualitative evidence indicates, practitioners and service users believe user engagement with reablement is important to supporting positive outcomes.
  - There is, however, no measure of engagement with reablement. Thus understanding of this concept within the context of reablement, and its impact on outcomes, has not been investigated.

42  
43 **What this paper adds:**  
44

- 45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- It reports the successful adaptation of an existing measure of physical rehabilitation engagement to a version suitable for use in reablement.
  - It discusses the importance of measuring engagement in future evaluations of reablement.
  - It considers current understandings of engagement within a context of an intervention often delivered by multiple staff.

## INTRODUCTION

Recent years have seen an increase in the use of interventions to prolong or restore independence, minimise reliance on social care or address preventable or unplanned hospital admissions (Aspinal, Glasby, & Rostgaard, 2016; Tessier, Beaulieu, McGinn et al., 2016). Reablement (also known as restorative care) is one such intervention, aiming to restore independence with respect to activities of daily living and thus reduce, or prevent an increase in state expenditure on health and social care provision (Metzelthin, Zijlstra, Rossum van et al., 2017; Tessier et al., 2016).

Reablement is a time-limited, intensive intervention delivered in the home (or other usual place of residence). It is implemented following discharge from an acute hospital admission, as a preventative measure to avoid re/admission to hospital or residential care, or to reduce the need for home care. Following specialist assessment, an individualised, goals-focussed plan is developed to restore an individual's functioning with respect to basic and instrumental activities of daily living (ADLs) (eg. getting around the home/outside, eating, continence, personal hygiene, making meals, managing medication) associated with living as independently as possible.

'Reablement practitioners' (lower grade staff trained in reablement but not holding a professional qualification) usually visit at least once per day to implement this plan, helping the person regain skills and confidence. Equipment or minor adaptations may be used to support this. The overall ethos of reablement – to support and enable people to do things for themselves – contrasts with traditional home care which “does things” to or for people, thereby promoting dependency (Metzelthin et al., 2017; Resnick, Boltz, & Galik, 2012). In

1  
2  
3 England, the typical duration of the intervention is 4-6 weeks, with the frequency and  
4  
5 duration of visits expected to reduce over this period (Ashworth, Longmate, & Morrison,  
6  
7 1992).  
8  
9

10  
11 Evidence regarding the effectiveness of reablement is limited and of variable quality. A  
12  
13 recent evidence review concluded that “[t]here is a moderate amount of moderate quality  
14  
15 evidence that reablement is more effective compared with conventional homecare” (p. 137)  
16  
17 (National Institute For Health And Care Excellence, 2017). Previous research has also  
18  
19 identified factors which may be associated with outcomes (Ariss, 2014; Dundee City Council  
20  
21 and Tayside NHS, 2010; Hjelle, Tuntland, Forland et al., 2017; Rabiee & Glendinning, 2011)  
22  
23 and the characteristics of the service user (Ghatorae, 2013; Glendinning, Jones, Baxter et al.,  
24  
25 2010; Hjelle et al., 2017; Rabiee & Glendinning, 2011)(*Reference removed for review*). These  
26  
27 include service user expectations, including their understanding that reablement is different  
28  
29 to traditional homecare; their motivation (e.g. wanting to be discharged home or to remain  
30  
31 at home); accepting the need for help; and the nature of the therapeutic alliance (Higgins,  
32  
33 Larson, & Schnall, 2017; Moe, Ingstad, & Brataas, 2017) (*Reference removed for review*).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Such findings align with conceptual understandings of intervention/patient engagement  
43  
44 (Bright, Kayes, Worrall et al., 2015; Higgins et al., 2017). Thus Bright et al (2015) refer to the  
45  
46 development of a “connection” (p.15) between practitioner and patient, or therapeutic  
47  
48 programme, and the patient becoming an “invested collaborator” (p.15) in the intervention.  
49  
50 Others stress that engagement is a purposeful act, with collaboration and cooperation being  
51  
52 an active choice on the part of the patient and done in order to maximise outcomes or  
53  
54 improve their experience of receiving an intervention (Higgins et al., 2017).  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Within physical rehabilitation, there is growing evidence that engagement with an  
6  
7 intervention impacts on short- and medium-term outcomes (Morghen, Morandi, Guccione  
8  
9 et al., 2017). This has led to calls to find effective ways to increase or support engagement  
10  
11 with an intervention, both on the part of service users and, interestingly and more recently,  
12  
13 practitioners (Bright et al., 2015). Given that the essence of reablement is active  
14  
15 participation by the service user, it is perhaps surprising that, to date, this construct has not  
16  
17 been specifically investigated within this context. The absence of a valid and reliable  
18  
19 measure of engagement may be one reason for this. This paper reports the adaptation, and  
20  
21 psychometric properties, of a measure of patient engagement used in physical rehabilitation  
22  
23 (the Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale (HRERS) (Kortte, Falk, Castillo et al.,  
24  
25 2007)) for use in reablement contexts (referred to as HRERS-Reablement Version (HRERS-  
26  
27 RV)).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Recent conceptual reviews of engagement have concluded that engagement is both an  
36  
37 internal *state* (reported by the individual or observable in their behaviour) and a *process* co-  
38  
39 constructed by the patient/service user and the practitioner (Bright et al., 2015; Higgins et  
40  
41 al., 2017). Within this conceptual framework, the HRERS-RV can be regarded as a  
42  
43 practitioner-reported measure of a service user's state of engagement.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **METHODS**

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Design

Once created by the research team, the HRERS-RV was contained in a battery of measures used in an evaluation of reablement services in England (*Reference removed for review*).

This evaluation investigated reablement outcomes at discharge and 6-months post-discharge and included an exploration of the impact of service and individual characteristics on outcomes. This paper is solely concerned with reporting the adaptation and psychometric testing of the HRERS-RV. Findings from the evaluation are reported elsewhere (*Reference removed for review*).

## Sample

Three reablement services, located in different areas in England, participated in the evaluation. Service users were recruited between November 2016 and July 2017. Inclusion criteria were: i) accepted reablement; ii) aged 18 years or over; iii) able to give informed consent. Details on recruitment processes are provided elsewhere (*Reference removed for review*). The total number of individuals recruited was 186, discharge data was collected from 129 participants. Sixty-four participants were followed up at 6-months post-discharge.

## Ethical Considerations

The study was approved by an NHS Research Ethics Committee (REC reference: *removed for review*).



## Data collection

The HRERS-RV was completed by a reablement practitioner when a study participant was discharged from the service.

## Outcome measures

Outcome measures used to test the HRERS-RV's predictive validity are described below.

These were completed (by the service user or the reablement practitioner) as part of the evaluation study at the start of receiving reablement (baseline), at discharge and at six-months after discharge. In terms of service user reported outcomes, baseline and discharge measures were administered by a member of the research team during a home visit. Six months post-discharge data were collected either by a home visit or via postal administration.

*The Barthel Index* (Mahoney & Barthel, 1965): based on observation, this practitioner-reported index measures patients' functional status across ten domains: faecal incontinence, urinary incontinence, personal care (cleaning teeth, shaving), using the toilet, feeding, transfers (e.g. chair to bed), walking, dressing, climbing stairs and bathing (or showering). Scoring of individual domains range between 0-15 (at 5 point intervals): domains vary in the number of intervals offered. The total score is used which ranges from 0 (no functioning) to 100 (independent functioning).

*Nottingham Extended Activities of Daily Living (NEADL) Scale* (Nouri & Lincoln, 1987): a self-report measure of functional ability, or independence, with respect to a wide range of

1  
2  
3 activities of daily living. It comprises 22 items, grouped into four areas of activities of daily  
4  
5 living: 'mobility' (six items), 'kitchen' (five items), 'domestic' (five items) and 'leisure' (six  
6  
7 items) activities. Each item is scored on the response to four options: No (0 points), With  
8  
9 help (0 points), On my own with difficulty (1 point), and On my own (1 point). The maximum  
10  
11 score is 22, with higher scores indicating greater independence.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 *General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12)*: The GHQ-12 (Goldberg, 1972) measures self-  
18  
19 reported mental health. It focuses on two major areas – the inability to carry out normal  
20  
21 functions (e.g. decision-making, enjoying day-to-day activities) and the appearance of new  
22  
23 and distressing experiences (e.g. low confidence, feeling depressed,). A 4-point response  
24  
25 scale is used: better than usual, same as usual, less than usual, much less than usual. When  
26  
27 computing the score, positive answers (better/same as usual) are scored as 0, and negative  
28  
29 answers (less/much less than usual) are scored as 1, hence a higher total score indicates  
30  
31 worse mental health. The GHQ is regarded as a robust indicator of minor psychiatric  
32  
33 morbidity (Pevalin, 2000).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **Instrument Development**

### 42 **HRERS – the original measure**

43  
44  
45  
46 The Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale (HRERS) is a five-item, practitioner  
47  
48 completed scale. It was developed in the United States to measure engagement with  
49  
50 physical and functional rehabilitation interventions (Kortte et al., 2007). It is one of a very  
51  
52 small number of measures of patient/service user engagement for use within physical  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 rehabilitation contexts. Importantly, unlike others (Bright et al., 2015), it is grounded in a  
4  
5 conceptual framework of engagement, developed by the authors following a review of  
6  
7 existing literature. Thus the scale authors defined the construct of 'engagement' as  
8  
9 comprising five dimensions: attendance, need for physical or verbal prompts to participate,  
10  
11 positive attitude towards the therapy activity, acknowledgement/acceptance of need for  
12  
13 services, and active participation. Each dimension is represent by one item (see Figure 1). A  
14  
15 six-point response format (never, seldom, some of the time, most of the time, nearly  
16  
17 always, always) is used to report the observed frequency, or consistency of each dimension.  
18  
19 Good psychometric properties are reported (Kortte et al., 2007).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 [Figure 1. Here]  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Adaptation of the HRERS**

31  
32 Permission was sought from the scale authors (corresponding author K. Kortte) to adapt the  
33  
34 HRERS for use with reablement. Aside from replacing the word 'rehabilitation' with  
35  
36 'reablement', adaptations were needed to make it appropriate for use with reablement in a  
37  
38 UK context.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 First, the fundamental ethos of the reablement approach is restorative (with respect to  
45  
46 independent living skills), whereas physical rehabilitation is based on notions of recovery  
47  
48 from injury, though it may incorporate reabling approaches. Second, reablement is  
49  
50 delivered in people's homes, whereas physical rehabilitation often requires individuals to  
51  
52 travel to clinics or is provided whilst an inpatient. This required the concept of 'attendance'  
53  
54 (item 1) - to be revised so that it was meaningful to reablement.  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Third, HRERS item 2, which captures whether verbal or physical prompts or cues were  
6 required, required significant adaptation. This was because of differences in the way  
7 practitioners' verbalisations and physical cues are in rehabilitation compared to reablement.  
8  
9 Verbal instruction/encouragement and touch/physical prompts are core elements of  
10 reablement practice. For example, providing instructions or offering advice, supporting  
11 mobility or a particular posture, and building confidence by verbal encouragements. In  
12 contrast, within physical rehabilitation, the extent to a therapist uses verbal cues or physical  
13 prompts is regarded as an indicator of the intensity of support required from the therapist  
14 to secure engagement, with cognitive deficits and/or low/negative mood being key reasons  
15 greater intensity of support. This item was therefore modified to *explicitly* ask about the  
16 degree to which a service user's cognitive state (in terms of cognitive decline or  
17 low/negative mood) was perceived to have affected their ability to take part in reablement.  
18  
19 Finally, given reablement practitioners do not hold a professional graduate qualification, we  
20 simplified language and sentence structure.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Two authors (BB, ALF) – with collective expertise in scale development and occupational  
43 therapy within rehabilitation and reablement settings – drafted an adapted version which  
44 sought to ensure items remained true to their conceptual domain but were meaningful to  
45 the reablement context. This first draft, and the rationale for the changes made, was shared  
46 with the wider research team and the Study Steering Committee (which included  
47 reablement practitioners). Additional minor modifications were made to language and  
48 sentence structure based on feedback.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Cognitive interviews (Willis, 2005) were then used to test the adapted version with 10  
6  
7 reablement practitioners based in two reablement services. Interviews were conducted in  
8  
9 two waves. The first wave (n=5) revealed that additional information was required in a  
10  
11 couple of items to ensure they were interpreted as intended. It also identified that  
12  
13 modification of sentence structure in one item would be likely to improve comprehension.  
14  
15 Finally, the word 'seldom' (a response option) was not consistently understood and  
16  
17 interviewees' suggested replacing it with 'rarely'. These findings were reviewed by the  
18  
19 research team and revisions made to the scale. The revised version was then tested in a  
20  
21 second wave of interviews (n=5). These interviews revealed no further concerns. The final  
22  
23 version was shared with the lead author of the HRERS (KTB; formerly Kathleen Kortte) who  
24  
25 approved the adaptations made.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Table 1 sets out the items comprising the HRERS-Reablement Version against the  
33  
34 conceptual domains and the corresponding item in the original HRERS.  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 [Table 1. Here]  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 The final version of the HRERS-RV is presented in Box 1.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 [Box 1. Here]  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 A total HRERS-RV score is calculated by summing up the scores on each of the five items  
4  
5 (range 0-30), with item 2 reverse scored. A higher score represents greater engagement  
6  
7 with the intervention.  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 **Instrument validation**

13  
14  
15 All data were double-entered, cleaned, and analysed using STATA 14.2 (24).  
16  
17

## 18 **Testing threats to validity of results**

19  
20 The characteristics of the sample (e.g. age, gender, reason for referral, involvement of  
21  
22 informal carers, health incident leading to need for reablement, number of health co-  
23  
24 morbidities) at each time-point (baseline, discharge, 6 months post-discharge) were  
25  
26 compared to identify possible sources of bias. Chi-square was used to test for significant  
27  
28 differences in the distributions of categorical variables across the three time points. T-tests  
29  
30 were used to test for differences in mean age of respondents across time points.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36 To test whether or not the adapted measure performed in a uniform way across the  
37  
38 population of individuals using reablement, we explored whether the above demographic  
39  
40 and intervention-relevant characteristics were associated with HRERS-RV scores using linear  
41  
42 regression. The significance level was set at  $\alpha=0.01$ .  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 **Reliability testing**

49  
50 Internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. Test, re-test reliability was  
51  
52 explored by calculating the correlation in scores at the two time-points (test, re-test) and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 testing for significant difference in mean total score at the two time-points using a paired T-  
4  
5 test.

6  
7  
8 [Note: Test-re-test data collection was carried out independent of the evaluation study.

9  
10 Service providers involved in the HRERS-RV adaptation work (providing access to staff for  
11  
12 cognitive interviews) provided access to staff (n=31) in three reablement services (none was  
13  
14 involved in the evaluation). Reablement practitioners based in these services completed the  
15  
16 HRERS-RV with respect to the same individual recently discharged from their service, and  
17  
18 then completed the measure again – with respect to the same individual - 2 weeks later.

19  
20 Each member of staff completed the HRERS-RV with respect to one service user.]  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Analysis**

29  
30 Construct validity was tested using factor analysis - namely, iterated Principal Axis Factoring  
31  
32 method - using orthogonal varimax rotation. This approach was used because we wanted to  
33  
34 estimate the degree of covariance across the five dimensions and this method was shown to  
35  
36 be more accurate in reproducing population loadings than Principal Components analysis  
37  
38 (Russel, 2002; Widaman, 1993). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO) was used to verify  
39  
40 the sampling adequacy for the analysis. KMO values range from 0 to 1, indicating the  
41  
42 proportion of variance in the variables that might be caused by underlying factors. KMO  
43  
44 values between 0.8 and 1 indicate that the sampling is adequate. Only factors with an  
45  
46 eigenvalue greater than 1 were considered significant. In addition, the scree plot was  
47  
48 examined for inflexions indicating distinct factors. Items with a rotated factor loading of at  
49  
50 least 0.6 and no cross-loading to other factors were considered significant (Tabachnick &  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Fidell, 2014).

## Predictive validity

Based on existing literature (Ashworth et al., 1992; Morghen et al., 2017), we expected the level of engagement with reablement to be associated with functional status outcomes at discharge from the intervention, and with longer-term outcomes (Kortte et al., 2007). The HRERS-RV asks staff to report on an individual's engagement across the entire duration of reablement. Hence it can be used to predict functional outcomes at discharge and longer-term outcomes.

We assessed the tool's predictive validity by testing the association between HRERS-RV score and scores on outcome measures at discharge (Barthel Index; NEADL scale) and 6 months post-discharge (NEADL scale). Linear regression models were run with scores on these measures outcome variables and the HRERS-RV score as a predictor. Each model controlled for respondents' functional status scores at baseline (or at discharge when looking at 6-months post-discharge outcomes) and for clustering within the data introduced by data collection across three sites. We performed a sensitivity analysis (Thabane, Mbuagbaw, Zhang et al., 2013) to assess whether a binary version of HRERS-RV scores had similar predictive validity as its scale version (originally, the HRERS was tested as a categorical variable (Kortte et al., 2007)). The binary score was created using a data-driven cut-off point: the median score (=27). Those scoring 27 or more were categorised as 'high engagement', and those scoring lower 'moderate or low engagement'.



## Discriminant validity

Mental health was hypothesised to impact engagement. Discriminant validity was tested by comparing regression models with the HRERS-RV score versus the mental health (GHQ-12) score as predictors of functional outcomes. If the HRERS-RV had good discriminant validity, it would be a stronger predictor of functional outcomes than GHQ-12 scores alone.

## FINDINGS

### Research population

Participant characteristics are summarised in Table 1. We found no evidence of statistically significant differences in the characteristics of the samples at the different data collection time points. Chi-square tests did not produce significant p values (at  $\alpha = 0.01$  threshold) ranging from 0.64 ('referral reason') to 0.91 ('help from friends and family'). Two-sample t-tests comparing the mean age of respondents at the different time points did not produce significant results (mean diff baseline - discharge=0.06,  $p=0.95$ ; mean diff discharge - 6 months post-discharge=0.2,  $p=0.83$ ).

[Table 1. Here]

At each time-point, the majority of respondents (57-60%) lived alone (Table 2) and were female (68%). Over half had had been referred to reablement because they were judged to be at risk of no longer being able to live at home independently ('remain at home'), the remainder had been referred for reablement at the point of being discharged from hospital

1  
2  
3 following an unplanned admission ('return home'). In terms of co-morbidities,  
4  
5 musculoskeletal problems (e.g. falls and fractures), were implicated in referrals to  
6  
7 reablement of over 59 per cent of the sample. At each time point, the great majority (89%)  
8  
9 were receiving informal care from friends and family.  
10

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 [Table 2. Here]  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## HRERS-RV summary statistics

The mean HRERS-RV score (n=126) was 26.1, median 27 (minimum possible score = 0; maximum = 30). The top 25% of the score distribution consisted of maximum scores, indicating a ceiling effect.

## Eliminating threats to validity of results

Some respondent characteristics (age, gender, reason for referral, living situation, informal carer involvement, type of co-morbidity) were associated with HRERS-RV scores (see Supporting Material). However, although these associations are statistically significant, their effect sizes are close to zero (ranging between 0.13- 1.8).

## Reliability testing

Cronbach's alpha correlation coefficient indicated that HRERS-RV is a uni-dimensional scale with high reliability  $\alpha=0.89$  (95%CI: 0.85-0.93).

Test – re-test scores (n=31) were compared using Pearson's correlation. The correlation coefficient between the two time points was 0.71, indicating an acceptable level of test – re-test reliability. The mean total scores were 25 (test) and 24.1 (re-test). This difference was not statistically significant (diff=0.9, P-value=0.114). These are preliminary results given the small sample size.

## Construct validity

An initial correlation matrix confirmed a significant amount of correlation between items.

Bartlett's test showed that the correlations between the five components were overall significantly different from zero ( $p < 0.001$ ,  $N = 126$ ). The determinant (det) of the correlation matrix indicated that there was no extreme multicollinearity across the variables, whilst not being completely unrelated (det=0.018). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure had a value of 0.82, which indicated good levels of sampling adequacy for the analysis.

One factor had an eigenvalue  $> 1$  (eigenvalue=3.28), explaining over 80% of the total variance. A scree plot showed a clear inflexion after the first factor, justifying keeping one single factor in the analysis. The (rotated) factor loadings for Factor 1 ranged from 0.40 to 0.95 (Table 3). Item 2 - ability to take part in reablement affected by memory difficulties or low mood – had a factor loading of 0.40. It was, however, decided to retain this item in order to replicate the conceptual underpinning of the original HRERS (where all items had a factor loading between 0.73 and 0.95 (Kortte et al., 2007)).

[Table 3. Here]

## Predictive validity

Table 4 provides descriptive statistics on respondents' functional status scores at baseline, discharge and 6-month follow-up. Between baseline and discharge, the mean Barthel score improved by 10.8 points, whilst NEADL scores were static. By 6 months post-discharge, however, mean and median NEADL scores had increased by 2 and 3 points respectively.

1  
2  
3 Standard deviations are slightly larger at successive time points, indicating a wider diversity  
4  
5 in outcomes as time goes on.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 [Table 4. Here]  
11  
12

13  
14 There is strong evidence of a positive association between HRERS-RV score and functional  
15 outcomes at discharge – on both the NEADL and Barthel measures (Table 5). At 6-months  
16 post-discharge, a similar - yet weaker - association was found between the HRERS-RV score  
17 and functional outcomes as measured by the NEADL Scale.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 [Table 5. Here]  
27  
28  
29

30 Next, the analysis was repeated using the binary version of the HRERS-RV score. This  
31 analysis replicated the findings based on total HRERS-RV score (reported above). Thus  
32 scoring 27 or higher on the HRERS-RV had, on average, 11.9 point higher assessor-reported  
33 functional status scores at discharge (Barthel Index) and 1.4 point higher self-reported  
34 functional status scores (NEADL scale) compared to those who scored under 27, see Table 6.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 This association was not significant at 6 months post-discharge.  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 [Table 6. Here]  
48

## 49 **Discriminant Validity**

50  
51  
52 The HRERS-RV summary score did not correlate with the GHQ-12 score at baseline ( $r=$   
53 0.0811). Moreover, the baseline mental health score was not a significant predictor of  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 functional outcomes (Barthel:  $p=0.145$ ,  $CI= -1.033, 0.152$ ; NEADL:  $p=0.739$ ,  $CI=-0.229, 0.323$ )  
4  
5 at discharge.

## 8 **DISCUSSION**

10  
11 This paper reports the adaptation of the Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale  
12  
13 (Kortte et al., 2007) for use within the reablement context, and the psychometric properties  
14  
15 of this adapted version: the HRERS-Reablement Version (HRERS-RV). This adaptation was  
16  
17 required due to differences in practices, or approach, between physical rehabilitation and  
18  
19 reablement. To the authors' knowledge, this is only available measure of engagement with  
20  
21 reablement.  
22  
23

24  
25  
26  
27 The HRERS-RV was developed for the use in an evaluation of reablement services in England  
28  
29 (*Reference removed for review*). One of the aims of the study was to identify and explore  
30  
31 individual and service characteristics associated with intervention outcomes. Existing  
32  
33 evidence from rehabilitation (Bright et al., 2015; Hochhalter, Song, Rush et al., 2010;  
34  
35 Resnick, Beaupre, McGilton et al., 2016), and qualitative evidence from previous studies of  
36  
37 reablement (Hjelle et al., 2017), indicated that it would be valuable and important to  
38  
39 investigate the impact of engagement on outcomes. Thus we developed the HRERS-RV and  
40  
41 included in the suite of measures used by the study, with the proviso that HRERS-RV data  
42  
43 would only be used if psychometric tests deemed it acceptable.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 The findings from our psychometric evaluation of the HRERS-RV are, overall, positive. It  
52  
53 measures a uni-dimensional construct and has good predictive and discriminant validity in  
54  
55 terms of discharge outcomes. Service user characteristics do not appear to significantly  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 affect the way the scale performs meaning that it can be used across the entire population  
4  
5 of reablement service users. Initial findings regarding test-re-test reliability are acceptable.  
6  
7 However, a relatively small sample size means that further testing is recommended.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Two specific issues require discussion and, potentially, further attention. First, one item  
13  
14 (concerning perceived impacts on cognitive or mood impairment on engagement) had a  
15  
16 factor loading of less than 0.6. However, we felt it important to maintain the conceptual  
17  
18 integrity of the HRERS in the revised version and therefore retained it. Interestingly, this  
19  
20 item proved the most difficult item to adapt to the reablement context; further work on the  
21  
22 wording of this item may address this issue.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 Second, we note the observed ceiling effect and question whether revisions to the response  
29  
30 format would address this. One option would be to change the number of response options  
31  
32 (Moret, Nguyen, Pillet et al., 2007). Alternatively, the frame of reference could be changed  
33  
34 from observed frequency of behaviours ('never' to 'always') to, for instance, how the target  
35  
36 individual compares with the practitioner's wider experience using, for example, response  
37  
38 options 'much less than usual' to 'more than usual'. This option would, however, represent  
39  
40 a significant departure from the original scale. Finally, instructions about completion could  
41  
42 further stress the importance of reflecting over the *entire* period of reablement.  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 Given the role played by the practitioner in securing or nurturing user engagement in an  
49  
50 intervention (Bright et al., 2015; Higgins et al., 2017), an alternative explanation for the  
51  
52 ceiling effect is that respondents (i.e. reablement staff) perceived the HRERS-RV as a  
53  
54 measure of their own skills and this affected their responses. This lends weight to the  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 argument for triangulating practitioner report with user-reported engagement (Bright et al.,  
4  
5 2015).  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 Whilst scores on functional outcomes were used to test the predictive validity of the HRERS-  
11  
12 RV, we note the wider implication of our findings. Specifically, they indicate that  
13  
14 engagement with reablement may impact both short-term and long-term functional  
15  
16 outcomes. This supports the argument for reablement services to attend to user  
17  
18 engagement. Equally, in research, engagement is a potentially important variable to  
19  
20 measure if we are to better understand factors impacting on intervention effectiveness.  
21  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 Attending to the issue of engagement in the reablement context adds an interesting  
27  
28 dimension to current understandings of this construct. In particular, it offers a new  
29  
30 perspective to the relational dimension of engagement which stresses the continuity of  
31  
32 relationship between patient and practitioner. However, reablement, at least in the UK, is  
33  
34 typically delivered by multiple staff (*Reference removed for review*).  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Findings from our wider evaluation (*Reference removed for review*) offer some early insights  
40  
41 into this. Interestingly, practitioners generally regarded the involvement of multiple staff as  
42  
43 a positive practice. Equally, service users did not typically express dissatisfaction with this.  
44  
45 That is not to say, however, that the 'relational' aspect of the intervention was down-  
46  
47 played. Rather, the involvement of multiple reablement practitioners was regarded as  
48  
49 *increasing* the chances of that at least one practitioner would 'connect' with the service  
50  
51 user. This suggests that, for some interventions, engagement may not be necessarily be  
52  
53 compromised when multiple staff are involved. Alternatively, for some interventions,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 service user's commitment to intervention goals play a more dominant role in influencing  
4  
5 levels of engagement compared to other interventions (Lequerica & Kortte, 2010; Lequerica,  
6  
7 Rapport, Whitman et al., 2006). These issues certainly warrant further exploration.  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 13 14 15 **Limitations**

16  
17  
18 There are some constraints to the data presented and the strengths of conclusions which  
19  
20 can be drawn. First, the HRERS-RV was only tested with service users from three reablement  
21  
22 services. Second, the sample size is smaller than would be desired. Third, the lack of a user-  
23  
24 reported measure of engagement limited our ability to test construct validity. Finally, the  
25  
26 sample used to assess test-retest reliability was very small meaning that only preliminary  
27  
28 evidence is reported.  
29  
30

## 31 32 33 **CONCLUSIONS**

34  
35 To conclude, there is growing acknowledgement of the role engagement plays in outcomes  
36  
37 of health and care interventions. It is therefore important to measure this construct in  
38  
39 evaluations of reablement – an intervention approach which is attracting high levels of  
40  
41 government investment in many countries (Aspinal et al., 2016; Legg, Gladman, Drummond  
42  
43 et al., 2016; G. Lewin, De San Miguel, Knuiman et al., 2013; G. F. Lewin, Alfonso, & Alan,  
44  
45 2013). The HRERS-RV offers the opportunity to do this, though we do recommend further  
46  
47 testing and, potentially, some revisions. In addition, the HRERS-RV will allow exploration of  
48  
49 the way service organisation and delivery characteristics affect user engagement with  
50  
51 reablement. This is particularly pertinent given the range of ways, at least in the UK, in  
52  
53 which reablement services are currently organised and delivered (10).  
54  
55  
56  
57

## REFERENCES

- Ariss, S. (2014). *National Audit of Intermediate Care: patient reported experiences*. Retrieved from Sheffield: <https://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/national-audit-of-intermediate-care-patient-reported-experiences-2015-full-report-of/r/a11G000000CTDEMIAS>
- Ashworth, P. D., Longmate, M. A., & Morrison, P. (1992). Patient participation: its meaning and significance in the context of caring. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *17*, 1430-1439. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.1992.tb02814.x
- Aspinal, F., Glasby, J., & Rostgaard, T. (2016). New horizons: Reablement - supporting older people towards independence. *Age and Ageing*, *45*, 574-578. doi:10.1093/ageing/afw094
- Bright, F., Kayes, N., Worrall, L., & McPherson, K. (2015). A conceptual review of engagement in healthcare and rehabilitation. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *37*, 643-654. doi:10.3109/09638288.2014.933899
- Dundee City Council and Tayside NHS. (2010). *Home care enablement service: Evaluation*. Retrieved from Dundee: [http://www.nhstaysidecdn.scot.nhs.uk/NHSTaysideWeb/idcplg?IdcService=GET\\_SEC\\_URE\\_FILE&dDocName=DOCS\\_071157&Rendition=web&RevisionSelectionMethod=LATESTRELEASED&noSaveAs=1](http://www.nhstaysidecdn.scot.nhs.uk/NHSTaysideWeb/idcplg?IdcService=GET_SEC_URE_FILE&dDocName=DOCS_071157&Rendition=web&RevisionSelectionMethod=LATESTRELEASED&noSaveAs=1)
- Ghatorae, H. (2013). *Reablement in Glasgow: quantitative and qualitative research*. Retrieved from Glasgow: <http://www.jitscotland.org.uk/resource/reablement-glasgow-quantitative-qualitative-research-report/>
- Glendinning, C., Jones, K., Baxter, K., Rabiee, P., Curtis, L., Wilder, A., Arksey, H., & Forder, J. (2010). *Home Care Re-ablement Services: Investigating the longer-term impacts (prospective longitudinal study)*. Retrieved from York: <https://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/research/pdf/Reablement.pdf>
- Goldberg, D. (1972). *The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire: a technique for the identification and assessment of non-psychotic psychiatric illness*. London, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Higgins, T., Larson, E., & Schnall, R. (2017). Unraveling the meaning of patient engagement: A concept analysis. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *100*, 30-36. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.09.002
- Hjelle, K. M., Tuntland, H., Forland, O., & Alvsvag, H. (2017). Driving forces for home-based reablement; a qualitative study of older adults' experiences. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, *25*, 1581-1589.
- Hochhalter, A. K., Song, J., Rush, J., Sklar, L., & Stevens, A. (2010). Making the most of your healthcare intervention for older adults with multiple chronic illnesses. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *81*, 207-2013. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2010.01.018
- Kortte, K., Falk, L., Castillo, R., Johnson-Greene, D., & Wegener, S. (2007). The Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale: development and psychometric properties. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *88*, 877-884. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2007.03.030
- Legg, L., Gladman, J., Drummond, A., & Davidson, A. (2016). A systematic review of the evidence on home care reablement services. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, *30*, 741-749. doi:10.1177/0269215515603220

- 1  
2  
3 Lequerica, A. H., & Kortte, K. (2010). Therapeutic engagement: A proposed model of  
4 engagement in medical rehabilitation. *American Journal of Physical Medical &*  
5 *Rehabilitation, 89*, 415-422. doi:10.1097/PHM.0b013e3181d8ceb2
- 6 Lequerica, A. H., Rapport, L. J., Whitman, R. D., Millis, S. R., Vangel, S. J. J., Hanks, R. A., &  
7 Axelrod, B. N. (2006). Psychometric properties of the Rehabilitation Therapy  
8 Engagement Scale when used among individuals with acquired brain injury.  
9 *Rehabilitation Psychology, 51*, 331-337.
- 10  
11 Lewin, G., De San Miguel, K., Knuiman, M., Alan, J., Boldy, D., Hendrie, D., & Vandermeulen,  
12 S. (2013). A randomised controlled trial of the Home Independence Program (HIP):  
13 an Australian restorative home-care programme for older adults. *Health & Social*  
14 *Care in the Community, 21*, 69-78. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2524.2012.01088.x
- 15 Lewin, G. F., Alfonso, H. S., & Alan, J. J. (2013). Evidence for the long term cost effectiveness  
16 of home care reablement programs. *Clinical Interventions in Aging, 8*, 1273-1281.
- 17 Mahoney, F., & Barthel, D. (1965). Functional Evaluation: the Barthel Index. *Maryland*  
18 *Medical Journal, 14*, 61-65.
- 19  
20 Metzeltin, S. F., Zijlstra, G. A. R., Rossum van, E., Man-van Ginkel de, J. M., Resnick, B.,  
21 Lewin, G., Parsons, M., & Kempen, G. I. J. M. (2017). 'Doing with...' rather than 'doing  
22 for...' older adults: rationale and content of the 'Stay Active at Home' programme.  
23 *Clinical Rehabilitation, 31*, 1419-1430. doi:10.1177/0269215517698733
- 24 Moe, A., Ingstad, K., & Brataas, H. V. (2017). Patient influence in home-based reablement  
25 for older persons: qualitative research. *BMC health services research, 17*.  
26 doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2715-0
- 27  
28 Moret, L., Nguyen, J. M., Pillet, N., Falissard, B., Lombrail, P., & Gasquet, I. (2007).  
29 Improvement of psychometric properties of a scale measuring inpatient satisfaction  
30 with care: a better response rate and a reduction of the ceiling effect. *BMC health*  
31 *services research, 7*. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-7-197
- 32  
33 Morghen, S., Morandi, A., Guccione, A. A., Bozzini, M., Guerini, F., Gatti, R., Del Santo, F.,  
34 Gentile, S., Trabucchi, M., & Bellelli, G. (2017). The association between patient  
35 participation and functional gain following inpatient rehabilitation. *Aging Clinical and*  
36 *Experimental Research, 29*, 729-736. doi:10.1007/s40520-016-0625-3
- 37 National Institute For Health And Care Excellence. (2017). *NICE Guideline NG74:*  
38 *Intermediate care including reablement*. Retrieved from London:  
39 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng74/evidence/full-guideline-pdf-4600707949>
- 40  
41 Nouri, F., & Lincoln, N. (1987). An extended ADL scale for use with stroke patients. *Clinical*  
42 *Rehabilitation, 1*, 301-305. doi:10.1177/026921558700100409
- 43 Pevalin, D. (2000). Multiple applications of the GHQ-12 in a general population sample: an  
44 investigation of long-term retest effects. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric*  
45 *Epidemiology, 35*.
- 46 Rabiee, P., & Glendinning, C. (2011). Organisation and delivery of home care re-ablement:  
47 what makes a difference? *Health and Social Care in the Community, 19*, 495-503.  
48 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2524.2011.01010.x
- 49  
50 Resnick, R., Beaupre, P., McGilton, K., Galik, E., Liu, W., Neuman, M., Gruber-Baldini, A.,  
51 Orwig, D., & Magaziner, J. (2016). Rehabilitation Interventions for Older Individuals  
52 with Cognitive Impairment Post-Hip Fracture: A Systematic Review. *Journal of the*  
53 *American Directors Association, 17*, 200-205. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2015.10.004
- 54 Resnick, R., Boltz, M., & Galik, E. (2012). *Restorative care nursing for older adults: A guide for*  
55 *all care settings* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Russel, D. W. (2002). In Search of Underlying Dimensions: The Use (and Abuse) of Factor  
4 Analysis in Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. *Personality and Social*  
5 *Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1629-1646. doi:10.1177/014616702237645  
6  
7 Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2014). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (Sixth ed.). Harlow: Pearson.  
8  
9 Tessier, A., Beaulieu, M. D., McGinn, C. A., & Latulippe, R. (2016). Effectiveness of  
10 Reablement: a systematic review. *Healthcare Policy*, 11, 49-59.  
11  
12 Thabane, L., Mbuagbaw, L., Zhang, S., Samaan, Z., Marcucci, M., Chenglin, Y., Thabane, M.,  
13 Giangregorio, L., Dennis, B., Kosa, D., Borg Debono, V., Dillenburg, R., Fruci, V.,  
14 Bawor, M., Lee, J., Wells, G., & Goldsmith, C. H. (2013). A tutorial on sensitivity  
15 analyses in clinical trials: the what, why, when and how. *BMC Medical Research*  
16 *Methodology*, 13. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-13-92  
17  
18 Widaman, K. F. (1993). Common factor analysis versus principal component analysis:  
19 differential bias in representing model parameters? *Multivariate Behavioral*  
20 *Research*, 28, 263-311. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr2803\_1  
21  
22 Willis, G. (2005). *Cognitive Interviewing: A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*. London,  
23 UK: Sage.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1: Items and concepts of HRERS and HRERS-RV**

**Table 2: Characteristics of sample for which HRERS-RV was completed**

**Table 3: Factor loadings after orthogonal varimax rotation**

**Table 4: Functional status of baseline, discharge and 6 months follow-up, Numbers (N), means, standard deviations (SD), medians, minimum and maximum**

**Table 5: Predictive validity of the HRERS-RV score**

**Table 6: Predictive validity of the HRERS-RV binary measure**

**Box 1: The Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale – Reablement Version (HRERS-RV)**

For Peer Review

**Table 1: Items and concepts of HRERS and HRERS-RV**

HRERS item	Concept (Kortte et al., 2007)	HRERS-RV item
The patient regularly attended my therapy/rehabilitation activity.	Attendance	When I made my visits, the person was ready to start their reablement session.
The patient required verbal or physical prompts to actively participate in my therapy/ rehabilitation activity. (Reverse score)	Ability to participate / engage affected by cognitive impairments or low mood	The person's ability to take part in the reablement sessions/visits was affected by memory difficulties and/or low mood.
The patient expressed a positive attitude towards my therapy/rehabilitation activity.	Positive attitude	The person expressed a positive attitude towards the reablement activities we worked on together.
The patient acknowledged a need for rehabilitation services and the benefits of therapy exercises or rehabilitation activities.	Acknowledgement/ acceptance of need	The client accepted that they needed to be reabled.
The patient actively participated in his/her rehabilitation therapy/activity.	Active participation	The person actively participated in my reablement sessions/visits.

**Table 2: Characteristics of sample for which HRERS-RV was completed**

		Number (percentage)		
		Baseline (n=186)	Discharge (n=129)	6 months post- discharge (n=62)
<b>Characteristic</b>				
<b>Gender</b>	Female	119 (69)	88 (68)	44 (69)
	Male	67 (36)	41 (32)	20 (31)
<b>Living alone</b>	No	79 (42)	51 (40)	27 (42)
	Yes	107 (58)	78 (60)	37 (58)
<b>Referral reason</b>	Return home	75 (40)	53 (41)	22 (34)
	Remain at home	111 (60)	76 (59)	42 (66)
<b>Help from friends and family</b>	No	20 (11)	13 (10)	7 (11)
	Yes	164 (89)	116 (90)	57 (89)
<b>Illness requiring readmission</b>	Musculoskeletal/Fall	111 (60)	78 (60)	43 (67)
	Respiratory problem	12 (6)	9 (7)	2 (3)
	Infection	20 (11)	16 (12)	4 (6)
	Other	43 (23)	26 (20)	15 (23)
<b>Number of comorbidities</b>	None	67 (36.)	46 (36)	28 (44)
	1	79 (42)	56 (43)	25 (39)
	2 or more	40 (22)	27 (21)	11 (17)

Age	Time	N	mean	SD	median	min	max
	Baseline	186	80.8	9.12	82	51	102
	Discharge	129	80.8	9.20	82	51	102

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 6 months post-

6 discharge

64

81.05

8.81

83

51

98

---

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review



**Table 3: Factor loadings after orthogonal varimax rotation**

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2
When I made my visits, the person was ready to start their reablement session.	0.84	0.04
The person's ability to take part in the reablement sessions/visits was affected by memory difficulties and/or low mood.	0.40	0.10
The person expressed a positive attitude towards the reablement activities we worked on together.	0.95	-0.02
The client accepted that they needed to be reabled.	0.82	-0.13
The person actively participated in my reablement sessions/visits.	0.92	0.14

For Peer Review

**Table 4: Functional status at baseline, discharge and 6 months follow-up, Numbers (N), means, standard deviations (SD), medians, minimum and maximum**

	Time	N	mean	SD	median	min	max
<b>NEADL</b>	Baseline	184	9.7	5.48	8.5	0	22
	Discharge	129	9.7	5.63	8	0	22
	6 months post-discharge	64	11.6	6.31	11	0	22
<b>Barthel</b>	Baseline	133	71.7	16.83	75	10	100
	Discharge	115	82.5	18.2	90	5	110

For Peer Review

**Table 5: Predictive validity of the HRERS-RV score**

<b>Outcome measure</b>	<b>Coefficient (95% CI)</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>N</b>
<i>Short-term outcomes (Discharge)</i>			
<b>Barthel Index</b>	1.592 (1.421, 1.763)	<0.001	81
<b>NEADL</b>	0.147 (0.096, 0.199)	<0.001	108
<i>Long-term outcomes (6 months post-discharge)</i>			
<b>NEADL</b>	0.345 (0.001, 0.688)	0.049	41

For Peer Review

**Table 6: Predictive validity of the HRERS-RV binary measure**

<b>Outcome measure</b>	<b>HRERS-RV binary predictor</b>	<b>Coefficient (95% CI)</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>N</b>
<i>Short-term outcomes (at discharge)</i>				
<b>Barthel Index</b>	Moderate/low eng.	ref		57
	High engagement	11.948 (10.982, 12.914)	<0.001	69
<b>NEADL</b>	Moderate/low eng.	ref		46
	High engagement	1.374 (1.211, 1.538)	<0.001	63
<i>Long-term outcomes (at 6-months post-discharge)</i>				
<b>NEADL</b>	Moderate/low eng.	ref		19
	High engagement	1.968 (-1.215, 5.151)	0.226	25

For Peer Review

**Box 1: The Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale – Reablement Version (HRERS-RV)**

**Hopkins Rehabilitation Engagement Rating Scale – Reablement Version  
(HRERS-RV)**

For each statement, please report your experience of working with this client over the entire course of your visits by ticking the relevant Figure (☐).

**When I made my visits, the person was ready to start their reablement session.**

Never     
  Rarely     
  Some of the time     
  Most of the time     
  Nearly always     
  Always

**The person’s ability to take part in the reablement sessions/visits was affected by memory difficulties and/or low mood.**

Never     
  Rarely     
  Some of the time     
  Most of the time     
  Nearly always     
  Always

**The person expressed a positive attitude towards the reablement activities we worked on together.**

Never     
  Rarely     
  Some of the time     
  Most of the time     
  Nearly always     
  Always

**The person accepted that they needed to be reabled.**

Never     
  Rarely     
  Some of the time     
  Most of the time     
  Nearly always     
  Always

**The person actively participated in my reablement sessions/visits.**

Never     
  Rarely     
  Some of the time     
  Most of the time     
  Nearly always     
  Always

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60