

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Regional Differences in the Care and Outcomes of Acute Stroke Patients: Evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR)

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040418
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Dwyer, Mitchell; University of Tasmania Faculty of Health, Francis, Karen; University of Tasmania Faculty of Health Peterson, Gregory; University of Tasmania, School of Pharmacy Ford, Karen; Royal Hobart Hospital, Centre of Education and Research Nursing and Midwifery Gall, Seana; University of Tasmania Phan, Hoang ; University of Tasmania, Menzies Institute for Medical Research; Pham Ngoc Thach University of Medicine, Department of Public Health Management Castley, Helen; Royal Hobart Hospital Wong, Lillian; Princess Alexandra Hospital White, Richard; Townsville Hospital Ryan, Fiona; New South Wales Department of Health Arthurson, Lauren; Echuca Regional Health Kim, Joosup; Monash University, Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences Cadilhac, Dominique; Monash University, Medicine Lannin, Natasha; Monash University Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Sciences, Neuroscience
Keywords:	Stroke medicine < INTERNAL MEDICINE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

## Regional Differences in the Care and Outcomes of Acute Stroke Patients: Evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR)

Mitchell Dwyer<sup>1</sup>, Karen Francis<sup>1</sup>, Gregory M. Peterson<sup>1</sup>, Karen M. Ford<sup>1,2</sup>, Seana Gall<sup>1</sup>, Hoang T. Phan<sup>1</sup>, Helen Castley<sup>2</sup>, Lillian Wong<sup>3</sup>, Richard White<sup>4</sup>, Fiona Ryan<sup>5</sup>, Lauren Arthurson<sup>6</sup>, Joosup Kim<sup>7,8</sup>, Dominique A. Cadilhac<sup>7,8\*</sup>, Natasha A. Lannin<sup>9,10\*</sup> on behalf of the AuSCR consortium.

\*equally contributed as senior authors

### Affiliations:

1. College of Health and Medicine, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
2. Royal Hobart Hospital, Tasmanian Health Service, Hobart, Australia
3. Princess Alexandra Hospital, Metro South Health, Brisbane, Australia
4. Townsville Hospital and Health Service, Townsville, Australia
5. Western New South Wales Local Health District, Australia
6. Echuca Regional Health, Echuca, Australia
7. Stroke and Ageing Research, Department of Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University, Clayton, Australia
8. Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Heidelberg, University of Melbourne, Australia
9. Alfred Health, Prahran, Australia
10. Department of Neuroscience, Central Clinical School, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

### ORCID IDs

Mitchell Dwyer	0000-0002-9956-2569
Karen Francis	0000-0003-3578-2498
Gregory M. Peterson	0000-0002-6764-3882
Karen M. Ford	0000-0003-2834-721X
Seana Gall	0000-0002-5138-2526
Hoang T. Phan	0000-0003-0506-2924
Helen Castley	N/A
Lillian Wong	0000-0003-1579-4109
Richard White	N/A
Fiona Ryan	N/A
Lauren Arthurson	N/A
Joosup Kim	0000-0002-4079-0428
Dominique A. Cadilhac	0000-0001-8162-682X
Natasha A. Lannin	0000-0002-2066-8345

**Word count:** 2,465

## Tables

Table 1. Patient characteristics by region

Table 2. Processes of care by region

Table 3. Survival analysis of stroke patients by region

Table 4. HRQoL at 90-180 day follow-up by region

**Key terms:** Stroke, care, healthcare disparities, health services accessibility, hospitalisation, urban health, rural health, outcome assessment (health care)

**Funding statement:** AuSCR was supported by grants from the NHMRC (1034415), Monash University, Queensland Health, Stroke Foundation, Allergan, Ipsen, and Boehringer Ingelheim.

## Author for correspondence:

Professor Natasha A. Lannin

Department of Neuroscience, Central Clinical School, Monash University

Level 6 Alfred Centre, 99 Commercial Road, Melbourne, VIC 3004 Australia.

Phone: +61 (3) 99 030 795

E-mail: natasha.lannin@monash.edu

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Access to evidence-based acute stroke care has been reported to be comparatively lower in rural as opposed to urban areas. It remains unclear which aspects of acute stroke care may differ by geographic location, and whether there are corresponding differences in long-term patient outcomes.

**Aims:** To compare the processes and outcomes of care in patients with stroke treated in urban versus rural hospitals that participate in the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR).

**Methods:** Data from the AuSCR registry between 2010 and 2015 were analysed using group comparisons; patients were divided into two groups (urban, rural) according to the Australian Standard Geographical Classification Remoteness Area classification. Between-group differences in processes of care, survival analyses up to 180 days and health-related quality of life at 90-180 days were explored using multilevel, multivariable analyses.

**Results:** Of the 28,115 patients, 8,159 (29%) were admitted to hospitals located within rural areas. Compared to those admitted to urban hospitals, patients in rural hospitals less often received thrombolysis if an ischaemic stroke (urban 12.7% vs rural 7.5%,  $p<0.001$ ) or received treatment in stroke units (urban 82.2% vs 76.5%,  $p<0.001$ ), and fewer were discharged with a care plan (urban 61.3% vs 44.7%,  $p<0.001$ ). No significant differences were found in terms of survival or overall self-reported quality of life.

**Conclusions:** Rural access to recommended components of acute stroke care was comparatively poorer; however, this did not appear to impact health outcomes at approximately 6 months.

## Article Summary

### *Strengths and Limitations of this Study*

- This is the first study in Australia to look at how access to acute stroke care varies between Australia's urban and rural areas, using data from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR).
- This study also reports on regional differences in patient outcomes, in the form of mortality and health-related quality of life (HRQoL) at up to 180 days post-stroke.
- Patient outcome measures were adjusted for known confounders.
- Hospitals participating in the AuSCR may not be representative of all Australian hospitals.

## Introduction

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

Internationally, evidence suggests that patients with stroke admitted to hospitals located in rural or regional areas have limited access to known evidence-based interventions, such as thrombolysis and stroke unit care, relative to those treated in urban hospitals.<sup>1</sup> There is a paucity of research investigating disparities in other, more elementary processes which define contemporary standards of acute stroke care, such as the prescription of secondary prevention medications. In addition, if there are differences in stroke care between urban and rural regions, determining if there are corresponding differences in patient outcomes warrants attention so as to permit future exploration of organisational, process or patient barriers preventing evidence-based stroke care being received.

Overall, prior research on the rural and urban outcomes of care has yielded inconsistent findings,<sup>1</sup> and is characterised by studies with inadequate risk adjustment,<sup>2-4</sup> or an indirect focus on urban-rural differences in outcomes.<sup>5-7</sup> Previous attempts to explore this issue have also been reliant on ‘hard’ outcome measures such as rates of mortality and readmission;<sup>8-10</sup> whereas regional differences in patients’ quality of life has been rarely investigated.<sup>11, 12</sup> The aim of this study was to compare the processes of care and outcomes for patients with stroke treated in urban compared with rural hospitals.

## Methods

### *Study design*

We used data from Australian hospitals that participate in the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR). The AuSCR registry is used to monitor processes of care provided to, and



1  
2  
3 the outcomes of, individuals hospitalised with acute stroke or transient ischaemic attacks  
4  
5 (TIAs) in Australian hospitals.<sup>13</sup> Death information (date and cause) from Australia's  
6  
7 National Death Index (NDI) are routinely linked to the AuSCR by the Australian Institute of  
8  
9 Health and Welfare (AIHW).<sup>14</sup> For this study, we used data from 50 hospitals submitted to  
10  
11 the AuSCR from January 2010 to December 2015, and we excluded patients admitted with  
12  
13 TIAs from this analysis. Selection bias is minimised in the AuSCR by use of an "opt-out"  
14  
15 approach when recruiting participants, whereby all eligible patients are registered unless they  
16  
17 or their next of kin nominates to have their data excluded;<sup>13</sup> during the study period less than  
18  
19 3% of potential participants opted out of the registry. Patients who did not opt out of the  
20  
21 registry, and who were discharged from hospital following their stroke, were followed up by  
22  
23 trained research staff between 90 and 180 days following their index admission (i.e. the first  
24  
25 registered event in AuSCR). This process uses a modified Dillman protocol,<sup>15</sup> whereby two  
26  
27 attempts are made to contact patients by post prior to an attempt by telephone.<sup>16</sup>  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Collected processes of care in AuSCR up to 2015 were: admission to a stroke unit,  
36  
37 thrombolysis (ischaemic stroke only), discharge on anti-hypertensive medication, and the  
38  
39 provision of a care plan. Hospitals located in the state of Queensland also collected four  
40  
41 additional variables: time to first mobilisation, dysphagia screen, aspirin within 48 hours, and  
42  
43 being discharged on antiplatelets or antithrombotics if an ischemic event. Indicator data with  
44  
45 responses of no, unknown, or missing were recoded as negative (proportion of missing data  
46  
47 ranged from <1% to 5.05%). Regional differences in patient mortality were assessed using  
48  
49 intervals of 7, 30, 90 and 180 days.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Participants' health-related quality of life (HRQoL) data were collected at 90-180 day follow-  
57  
58 up using the EuroQoL-5 dimension-3 level (EQ-5D-3L) instrument.<sup>17</sup> Respondents were  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 asked to report their health status in five domains (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain or  
4 discomfort, and anxiety or depression) with each domain having three possible responses (no  
5 problems, some problems, and extreme problems). Respondents use a Visual Analogue Scale  
6 (VAS) to rate their overall perceived health from 0 to 100, with 0 being the worst imaginable  
7 health state and 100 the best imaginable health state.<sup>17</sup> The VAS was coded as 0 for  
8 individuals who had died within the follow-up period.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 *Statistical analysis*

20  
21  
22 Hospitals were divided into categories of 'urban' or 'rural' based on their classification under  
23 the Australian Standard Geographical Classification Remoteness Area (ASGC-RA) system.<sup>18</sup>  
24 Hospitals located in ASGC-RA category 1 (i.e. major cities) were regarded as 'urban', while  
25 those in categories 2 or above were regarded as 'rural'. The majority of hospitals (>95%) that  
26 contribute data to AuSCR are funded under the public health care scheme. Participants'  
27 baseline characteristics were compared between regions using  $\chi^2$  tests for categorical data,  
28 and Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests for continuous variables. Care processes were expressed as the  
29 proportion of eligible patients who received each form of care and were analysed by location  
30 (urban or rural) using  $\chi^2$  tests. Participants' responses to the EQ-5D-3L instrument were  
31 expressed as the number of individuals who encountered problems with each domain, with  
32 'some problems' and 'extreme problems' being recoded into one category. Regional  
33 differences within each domain were then analysed using  $\chi^2$  tests.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Cox proportional hazards regression analysis was conducted to assess deaths within 7, 30, 90,  
53 and 180 days. Logistic regression was used to assess regional differences in each of the EQ-  
54 5D-3L domains. Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke,  
55 ability to walk on admission (as a validated measure of stroke severity)<sup>19</sup> and socioeconomic  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 status (SES) using the index of relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage  
4 (IRSAD).<sup>20</sup> Each regression model also accounted for inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital  
5 stroke, and whether the individual received treatment in a stroke unit. Patient clustering was  
6 adjusted for directly in each of our models, to account for correlation between patients  
7 admitted to the same hospital. Data were analysed using Stata/SE 12.<sup>21</sup>  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 *Ethical approval*

18 All participating hospitals have provided ethical and governance approvals for AuSCR data  
19 collection and analysis. Ethical approval was obtained from the AIHW to conduct data  
20 linkage to the NDI, and from the Tasmanian Human Research Ethics Committee to conduct  
21 this data analysis (reference H0017787).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Results**

32 Between 2010 and 2015, 28,115 episodes of care from 50 hospitals were registered in the  
33 AuSCR. Of these episodes, 8,159 (29%) were for individuals admitted to hospitals located  
34 within rural areas. Compared to those from urban areas, individuals from rural areas were  
35 more likely to have been born in Australia, have an indigenous background, and be of a lower  
36 SES (Table 1). Rural patients were also more likely than urban patients to be diagnosed with  
37 a stroke of ‘undetermined’ subtype (8.1% vs 3.6%). When compared to urban patients, those  
38 treated in rural hospitals had poorer access to several clinical processes of care (Table 2,  
39 online supplement 1 for variables collected only in Queensland). Specifically, rural patients  
40 were less likely to be admitted to a stroke unit (odds ratio [OR] = 0.70, 95% Confidence  
41 Interval [CI] 0.66 to 0.74), receive intravenous thrombolysis in ischaemic stroke (OR = 0.55,  
42 95% CI 0.50 to 0.62), or be provided with a care plan at time of discharge (OR = 0.59, 95%  
43 CI 0.54 to 0.64). There were no significant differences between regions in prescribing rates of  
44 anti-hypertensive medications at discharge (OR = 0.97, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.03). Regional  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

differences in the proportion of patients discharged home were not observed, but urban patients were more likely to die in hospital in the unadjusted comparisons (Table 2). The median LOS for rural patients was one day shorter than that of urban patients, and this remained the case after adjustment for potential confounders (coefficient -1, 95% CI -1.97 to -.03).

**Table 1. Patient characteristics by region**

Characteristics	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value
No. of sites	25 (50)	25 (50)	
No. of cases	19,956 (71)	8,159 (29)	
Female	9,095 (45.6)	3,770 (46.2)	0.335
<b>Age (years)</b>			
<65	4,910 (24.6)	2,095 (25.7)	0.030
65-74	4,468 (22.4)	1,887 (23.1)	
75-84	6,141 (30.8)	2,469 (30.3)	
85+	4,431 (22.2)	1,707 (20.9)	
Median age in years (Q1, Q3) <sup>a</sup>	76.1 (65.2, 84.2)	75.4 (64.7, 83.6)	0.003
<b>State</b>			
New South Wales	3,252 (16.3)	805 (9.9)	<0.001
Queensland	6,675 (33.4)	4,401 (53.9)	
Tasmania	-	1,118 (13.7)	
Victoria	9,133 (45.8)	1,835 (22.5)	
Western Australia	896 (4.5)	-	
Born in Australia	11,916 (59.7)	6,282 (77)	<0.001
Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander	174 (0.9)	262 (3.2)	<0.001
<b>Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage</b>			
Quintile 1 (most disadvantaged)	2,367 (12.3)	2,557 (34.4)	<0.001
Quintile 2	2,764 (14.3)	1,932 (26)	
Quintile 3	3,335 (17.3)	1,603 (21.6)	
Quintile 4	4,837 (25.1)	1,092 (14.7)	
Quintile 5 (most advantaged)	5,986 (31)	244 (3.3)	
Able to walk on admission (stroke severity)	6,055 (32.7)	2,439 (34.6)	0.003
<b>Stroke subtype</b>			
Intracerebral haemorrhagic	3,247 (16.3)	1,177 (14.4)	<0.001
Ischaemic	15,962 (80.1)	6,313 (77.5)	
Undetermined	709 (3.6)	658 (8.1)	
Transfer from other hospitals	2,191 (11.2)	1,739 (21.6)	<0.001
In-hospital stroke	1,156 (5.9)	407 (5.1)	0.008
Length of stay, median (Q1, Q3) <sup>a</sup> days	6 (3-10)	5 (2-8)	<0.001
Died in hospital <sup>b</sup>	2,216 (11.3)	720 (9.5)	<0.001
<b>Discharge destination</b>			
Home	7,353 (41.4)	2,899 (39)	0.092
Rehabilitation	6,234 (35.1)	2,137 (28.7)	<0.001
Aged care	1,057 (6)	326 (4.4)	<0.001
Other	3,096 (17.5)	2,077 (27.9)	<0.001

**EQ-5D-dimensions**

## Mobility

No problems	4,171 (47.1)	1,791 (48.4)	
Some problems	4,056 (45.8)	1,714 (46.4)	
Extreme problems	631 (7.1)	193 (5.2)	<0.001

## Self-care

No problems	5,784 (65.2)	2,499 (67.4)	
Some problems	2,012 (22.7)	872 (23.5)	
Extreme problems	1,069 (12.1)	339 (9.1)	<0.001

## Usual activities

No problems	3,445 (38.9)	1,448 (39.1)	
Some problems	3,590 (40.6)	1,571 (42.3)	
Extreme problems	1,809 (20.5)	688 (18.6)	0.034

## Pain/discomfort

No problems	4,401 (50)	1,876 (50.9)	
Some problems	3,955 (44.9)	1,622 (44)	
Extreme problems	446 (5.1)	190 (5.1)	0.621

## Anxiety/depression

No problems	4,632 (52.8)	1,948 (52.9)	
Some problems	3,630 (41.3)	1,527 (41.5)	
Extreme problems	518 (5.9)	208 (5.6)	0.860

<sup>a</sup>Q1: 25th percentile; Q3: 75th percentile

<sup>b</sup><5% missing/not documented data.

**Table 2. Processes of care by region**

	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value
<b>Evidence-based therapies (all states)</b>			
Treated in a stroke unit	16,408 (82.2)	6,241 (76.5)	<0.001
Intravenous thrombolysis for ischaemic stroke	2,007 (12.7)	463 (7.5)	<0.001
Discharged on antihypertensives	12,184 (70.6)	4,895 (69.9)	0.315
Care plan on discharge to community	4,871 (61.3)	1,441 (44.7)	<0.001

There were no significant differences between geographical groups in terms of survival up to 180 days (Table 3). In relation to HRQoL, no regional differences were observed in four of the EQ-5D domains, namely Anxiety/Depression, Mobility, Self-care, and Usual Activities (Table 4). Rural patients were, however, significantly less likely to have reported symptoms of pain or discomfort during the follow up period (OR = 0.88, 95% CI 0.79 to 0.97,  $p = 0.015$ ). Rural patients also had marginally higher perceived health, as measured by VAS, than their urban counterparts (70 vs 68,  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 3. Survival analysis of rural stroke patients as compared to urban stroke patients**

Time to death	Urban n (%)	Rural n (%)	p-value	Model*	
				HR	95% CI
Up to 7 days	1,750 (8.8)	769 (9.4)	0.081	0.98	(0.79-1.21)
8 to 30 days	1,242 (6.2)	491 (6)	0.608	1.02	(0.87-1.20)
31 to 90 days	745 (3.7)	265 (3.2)	0.055	0.88	(0.73-1.06)
91 to 180 days	526 (2.6)	202 (2.5)	0.439	0.88	(0.69-1.11)

\*Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke, ability to walk on admission, socioeconomic status, inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital stroke, and stroke unit admission

**Table 4. Outcomes at 90-180 day follow-up of rural patients as compared to urban patients**

EQ-5D-dimensions	Urban n (%)	Rural n (%)	p-value	Model		
				OR	95% CI	p-value
Mobility	4,687 (52.9)	1,907 (51.6)	0.169	1.02	(0.92-1.13)	0.717
Self-care	3,081 (34.8)	1,211 (32.6)	0.023	0.92	(0.80-1.06)	0.235
Usual activities	5,399 (61)	2,259 (60.9)	0.910	0.95	(0.85-1.06)	0.376
Pain/discomfort	4,401 (50)	1,812 (49.1)	0.376	0.88	(0.79-0.97)	0.015
Anxiety/depression	4,148 (47.2)	1,735 (47.1)	0.890	0.98	(0.87-1.10)	0.759
<b>Median VAS (Q1, Q3)</b>	68 (40, 80)	70 (50, 83)	<.001	-	-	-

\*Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke, ability to walk on admission, socioeconomic status, inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital stroke, and stroke unit admission

## Discussion

The primary aim of this study was to assess whether there are differences in the quality of care and outcomes for patients treated in urban and rural locations. We found that patients admitted to rural hospitals in Australia were less likely to receive some key care processes that are recommended in our national stroke clinical guidelines.<sup>22</sup> However, for the most part, we did not observe corresponding differences in patient 90-180 day outcomes.

1  
2  
3 Patients admitted to rural hospitals were significantly less likely to receive treatment in a  
4 stroke unit (76.5% vs 82.2%) despite only one rural hospital not being equipped with a stroke  
5 unit (n=30 episodes of care). This finding suggests that while nearly all rural sites had  
6 facilities which met the minimum criteria for stroke units,<sup>23</sup> many were unable to utilise their  
7 stroke unit's full potential. As observed by Dwyer et al.,<sup>24</sup> hospitals without 'quarantined'  
8 stroke unit beds may be unable to offer specialist care to stroke patients at times when there is  
9 demand for beds from other medical specialties. Such hospitals may benefit from using  
10 clinical coordinators to facilitate organisational change, as recommended by Cadilhac and  
11 colleagues.<sup>25</sup>  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 It should be noted that during the study period only 45% of patients located in Australia's  
27 'regional' areas received treatment in a stroke unit, and only 3.3% of all stroke unit beds were  
28 located in regional areas.<sup>26, 27</sup> Taken together, these statistics indicate that access to stroke  
29 units within rural hospitals participating in the AuSCR was markedly better than the national  
30 average. Given that there is a well-established link between stroke unit admission and access  
31 to key aspects of acute stroke care,<sup>28</sup> future efforts should focus on increasing the number of  
32 stroke units within Australia's regional areas, and improving access to existing stroke units.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Consistent with other studies, rural patients remained less likely than urban patients to be  
46 administered thrombolysis. The provision of thrombolysis is known to be influenced by a  
47 host of patient, clinician and system-related factors.<sup>29</sup> Of these factors, patients' distance to  
48 hospitals, accessing brain imaging after-hours, and obtaining specialist input are among the  
49 most pertinent issues encountered by clinicians providing thrombolysis in rural areas.<sup>30-32</sup>  
50  
51 Rural-based clinicians in the Australian state of Victoria have been able to obtain specialist  
52 input and improve thrombolysis rates through the use of a telemedicine program.<sup>33</sup> The use of  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 such technology in all regional areas of the country is urgently needed in order to increase  
4 rates of thrombolysis administration.<sup>34</sup>  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 We did not observe differences by location in rates of prescription for antihypertensive  
11 medications at hospital discharge. As has been noted previously,<sup>35</sup> this may reflect the fact  
12 that the management of patients' blood pressure for primary or secondary prevention is not  
13 necessarily specific to stroke, and does not require any additional resources. In any case, the  
14 rates of prescription for antihypertensive medications at discharge from both regions were  
15 substantially less than expected based on previous AuSCR data, indicating that more work  
16 needs to be done to improve this aspect of evidence-based care.<sup>36</sup>  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Despite marked differences in access to stroke unit care and thrombolysis, we did not observe  
29 any regional differences in rates of survival at up to 180 days post-stroke. This may be  
30 because access to acute stroke care, when considered in its entirety, was reasonably  
31 comparable between the study's urban and rural hospitals. This notion is supported by the  
32 fact that the study's rural hospitals, by virtue of their participation in the registry, are likely to  
33 be highly motivated to monitor and improve their provision of stroke care, and perhaps are  
34 better resourced than other rural sites. Furthermore, there is evidence that within the state of  
35 Queensland (online supplement 1) patients in rural hospitals were provided evidence-based  
36 therapies more often than those in urban hospitals. These differences warrant further research.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 In relation to HRQoL, we observed that with the exception of the pain/discomfort domain,  
52 there were no significant regional differences in any of the EQ-5D domains or VAS scores.  
53 These findings stand in contrast to multiple surveys conducted by the Australian government,  
54 in which rural residents had an overall lower self-reported health status.<sup>37, 38</sup> The disparity  
55 between regions in terms of self-reported pain/discomfort may point towards regional  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 differences in attitudes towards pain management. Indeed, literature on cancer patients in  
4 Australia has highlighted that a culture of stoicism and self-reliance within rural areas can  
5 make individuals less likely to report symptoms of pain<sup>39</sup> and delay seeking medical  
6 assistance.<sup>40</sup> There are other demographic factors which may partially explain this finding.  
7  
8 For instance, previous researchers using the AuSCR data have found that patients with stroke  
9 requiring an interpreter are more likely to report symptoms of pain.<sup>41</sup> Given that urban  
10 patients in this study were far less likely to have been born in Australia (i.e. 59.7% vs 77%),  
11 the impact of the respondents' English-speaking ability on our findings cannot be discounted.  
12  
13 Previous research using the AuSCR data has also highlighted that, other factors remaining  
14 equal, younger people from a lower SES are more likely to report symptoms of  
15 anxiety/depression.<sup>42</sup> We also found that rural patients had a significantly higher perceived  
16 health status than urban patients (70 vs 68 via VAS); however, it is unlikely that this  
17 difference represents a clinically relevant finding.<sup>43</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Our study design and data have several limitations. Firstly, the distribution of urban and rural  
36 patients in this study (71% vs 29%) may not reflect that of the broader Australian hospital  
37 population, which recently stood at 64% and 36%, respectively.<sup>44</sup> We also did not use any  
38 data in relation to participants' residential addresses. It is therefore possible that some  
39 individuals who were admitted to urban hospitals resided in rural areas, and vice versa. A  
40 further limitation is that our HRQoL data did not factor in patients' health prior to their  
41 stroke, meaning it is possible that some individuals' HRQoL deficits may relate to pre-  
42 existing conditions. Despite these limitations, our study is the first of its kind in Australia to  
43 comprehensively examine urban-rural differences in access to acute stroke care and the  
44 associated patient outcomes. To the best of the authors' knowledge, it is also among the first  
45 in the world to report on urban-rural differences in patients' quality of life post-stroke.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Conclusions

This is the largest study to date examining geographic disparities in processes of stroke care, and providing a benchmark for the development and testing of interventions that may have the potential to reduce the differences between rural and urban patients with acute stroke. Interestingly, while we identified disparities in processes of care, we did not observe any association between geographic region and patient outcomes in terms of mortality or HRQoL. There are clear opportunities to better understand why the impact of these process of care variables on stroke outcomes are more pronounced in urban areas. Our findings underscore the importance of understanding how geographical area influences HRQoL; continued efforts to determine the impact of stroke care post-discharge are important. Future work in this field should also focus on redressing the resourcing disparities, in particular increasing the number of rural hospitals which meet the minimum criteria for stroke unit care.

## Declaration of competing interests

DAC is the data custodian for the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry and is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council fellowship (1154273). She has received grants paid to her institution from Stroke Foundation, Melbourne Health, Victorian government, Queensland government, Tasmanian government, South Australian government, Western Australian government, Boehringer Ingelheim, Medtronic, Pfizer, Amgen and Shire. NAL is the Chair of the Management Committee of the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry, and a member of the Stroke Foundation Clinical Council. NAL is supported by National Heart Foundation of Australia (GNT102055).

### Author Contributions

HC, MD, GP, SG, KMF, KF and DC contributed to the study design and concept. JK and DC contributed towards the statistical analyses. HTP, HC, LW, RW, FR, and LA participated in the manuscript preparation, editing and revision and agreed upon the final version of the paper. NL contributed to the interpretation of results and was heavily involved in the final preparation of the paper.

**Data sharing statement:** contact can be made with the corresponding author for queries relating to unpublished data.

## References

1. Dwyer M, Rehman S, Ottavi T, et al. Urban-rural differences in the care and outcomes of acute stroke patients: systematic review. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2018; 397: 63-74.
2. Fleet R, Bussi eres S, Tounkara FK, et al. Rural versus urban academic hospital mortality following stroke in Canada. *PloS One* 2018; 13: e0191151.
3. Harnod D, Choi W-M, Chang R-E, et al. Are major medical centers better for stroke and myocardial infarction patients in Taiwan? A nationwide population-based study. *International Journal of Gerontology* 2010; 4: 137-142.
4. Lichtman JH, Leifheit-Limson EC, Jones SB, et al. 30-day risk-standardized mortality and readmission rates after ischemic stroke in critical access hospitals. *Stroke* 2012; 43: 2741-2747.
5. Borhani-Haghighi A, Safari R, Heydari ST, et al. Hospital mortality associated with stroke in southern Iran. *Iranian Journal of Medical Sciences* 2013; 38: 314.
6. Hemphill JC, 3rd, Newman J, Zhao S, et al. Hospital usage of early do-not-resuscitate orders and outcome after intracerebral hemorrhage. *Stroke* 2004; 35: 1130-1134. DOI: 10.1161/01.STR.0000125858.71051.ca.
7. Ido MS, Bayakly R, Frankel M, et al. Administrative data linkage to evaluate a quality improvement program in acute stroke care, Georgia, 2006-2009. *Preventing Chronic Disease* 2015; 12: E05. DOI: 10.5888/pcd12.140238.
8. Kilkenny MF, Dewey HM, Sundararajan V, et al. Readmissions after stroke: linked data from the Australian stroke clinical registry and hospital databases. *Med J Aust* 2015; 203: 102-106.
9. Saposnik G, Baibergenova A, O'Donnell M, et al. Hospital volume and stroke outcome Does it matter? *Neurology* 2007; 69: 1142-1151.

10. Thompson MP, Zhao X, Bekelis K, et al. Regional variation in 30-day ischemic stroke outcomes for medicare beneficiaries treated in Get With The Guidelines–Stroke hospitals. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* 2017; 10. DOI: 10.1161/circoutcomes.117.003604.
11. Santos NMF, Tavares DMS and Dias FA. Quality of life comparasion of elderly urban and rural stroke victims. *Revista de Pesquisa: Cuidado é Fundamental Online* 2014; 6: 387-397.
12. Nuttaset Manimmanakorn M, Vichiansiri R, Nuntharuksa C, et al. Quality of life after stroke rehabilitation among urban vs. rural patients in Thailand. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2008; 9: 394-399.
13. Cadilhac DA, Lannin NA, Anderson CS, et al. Protocol and pilot data for establishing the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry. *International Journal of Stroke* 2010; 5: 217-226.
14. Cadilhac DA, Kilkenny MF, Levi CR, et al. Risk-adjusted hospital mortality rates for stroke: evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR). *Med J Aust* 2017; 206: 345-350.
15. Dillman DA. The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual review of sociology* 1991; 17: 225-249.
16. Lannin NA, Anderson C, Lim J, et al. Telephone follow-up was more expensive but more efficient than postal in a national stroke registry. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013; 66: 896-902.
17. Group TE. EuroQol-a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health policy* 1990; 16: 199-208.
18. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC),

- 1  
2  
3 <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/8B8ABC8EC6>  
4 [2D8F46CA2570AE000DD3B5?opendocument](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/8B8ABC8EC6) (2011).  
5  
6  
7  
8 19. Counsell C, Dennis M, McDowall M, et al. Predicting outcome after acute and  
9 subacute stroke. *Stroke* 2002; 33: 1041-1047.  
10  
11  
12 20. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) 2016,  
13 <https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2033.0.55.001Main+Features>  
14 [12016?OpenDocument](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2033.0.55.001Main+Features) (2018).  
15  
16  
17 21. StataCorp L. Stata data analysis and statistical Software. *Special Edition Release*  
18 2007; 10: 733.  
19  
20  
21 22. Stroke Foundation. Clinical guidelines for stroke management,  
22 <https://informme.org.au/en/Guidelines/Clinical-Guidelines-for-Stroke-Management>  
23 <https://informme.org.au/en/Guidelines/Clinical-Guidelines-for-Stroke-Management>  
24 (2020).  
25  
26  
27 23. Stroke Foundation. Acute Stroke Services Framework 2019,  
28 [https://strokefoundation.org.au/-](https://strokefoundation.org.au/-/media/E6682A70FFF0489FA66D28042C0FF472.ashx?la=en)  
29 [/media/E6682A70FFF0489FA66D28042C0FF472.ashx?la=en](https://strokefoundation.org.au/-/media/E6682A70FFF0489FA66D28042C0FF472.ashx?la=en) (2019).  
30  
31  
32 24. Dwyer M. Health care providers' perceptions of factors that influence the provision of  
33 acute stroke care in urban and rural settings: a qualitative study [thesis chapter].  
34 *Regional Differences in Acute Stroke Care and Patient Outcomes*. Hobart, Australia:  
35 University of Tasmania, 2020.  
36  
37  
38 25. Cadilhac DA, Purvis T, Kilkenny MF, et al. Evaluation of Rural Stroke Services Does  
39 Implementation of Coordinators and Pathways Improve Care in Rural Hospitals?  
40 *Stroke* 2013; 44: 2848-2853.  
41  
42  
43 26. Stroke Foundation. National stroke audit acute services report (2017),  
44 <https://informme.org.au/en/stroke-data/Acute-audits> (2017).  
45  
46  
47 27. National Stroke Foundation. *Clinical Audit: Organisational Survey Report 2013*.  
48 Melbourne :: National Stroke Foundation, 2013, p.52 p.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 28. Stroke Unit Trialists Collaboration. Organised inpatient (stroke unit) care for stroke.  
4  
5 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013; 9. DOI:  
6  
7 10.1002/14651858.CD000197.pub3.  
8  
9  
10 29. Baatiema L, Otim ME, Mnatzaganian G, et al. Health professionals' views on the  
11  
12 barriers and enablers to evidence-based practice for acute stroke care: a systematic  
13  
14 review. *Implementation Science* 2017; 12: 74.  
15  
16  
17 30. Kapral M, Hall R, Gozdyra P, et al. Geographic access to stroke care services in rural  
18  
19 communities in Ontario, Canada. *The Canadian journal of neurological sciences Le*  
20  
21 *journal canadien des sciences neurologiques* 2020: 1.  
22  
23  
24 31. Moloczij N, Mosley I, Moss K, et al. Is telemedicine helping or hindering the delivery  
25  
26 of stroke thrombolysis in rural areas? A qualitative analysis. *Internal Medicine*  
27  
28 *Journal* 2015; 45: 957-964.  
29  
30  
31 32. Joubert J, Prentice LF, Moulin T, et al. Stroke in rural areas and small communities.  
32  
33 *Stroke* 2008; 39: 1920-1928.  
34  
35  
36 33. Bladin CF, Kim J, Bagot KL, et al. Improving acute stroke care in regional hospitals:  
37  
38 clinical evaluation of the Victorian Stroke Telemedicine program. *Medical Journal of*  
39  
40 *Australia* 2020; 212: 371-377. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50570.  
41  
42  
43 34. Lindley RI. Telemedicine is improving outcomes for patients with stroke. *The*  
44  
45 *Medical journal of Australia* 2020; 212: 364-365. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50587.  
46  
47  
48 35. Koifman J, Hall R, Li S, et al. The association between rural residence and stroke care  
49  
50 and outcomes. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2016; 363: 16-20. DOI:  
51  
52 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2016.02.019>.  
53  
54  
55 36. Dalli LL, Kim J, Thrift AG, et al. Disparities in Antihypertensive Prescribing After  
56  
57 Stroke. *Stroke* 2019; 50: 3592-3599. DOI: doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.026823.  
58  
59  
60 37. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *A snapshot of men's health in regional and*  
*remote Australia*. Australia Institute of Health and Welfare, 2010.

- 1  
2  
3 38. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Australia's Health 2012*. 2012. Australian  
4 Institute of Health and Welfare.  
5  
6  
7  
8 39. Pateman KA, Cockburn NL, Batstone MD, et al. Quality of life of head and neck  
9 cancer patients in urban and regional areas: An Australian perspective. *Australian  
10 Journal of Rural Health* 2018; 26: 157-164.  
11  
12  
13  
14 40. Emery JD, Walter FM, Gray V, et al. Diagnosing cancer in the bush: a mixed-  
15 methods study of symptom appraisal and help-seeking behaviour in people with  
16 cancer from rural Western Australia. *Family practice* 2013; 30: 294-301.  
17  
18  
19  
20 41. Kilkenny Monique F, Lannin Natasha A, Anderson Craig S, et al. Quality of Life Is  
21 Poorer for Patients With Stroke Who Require an Interpreter. *Stroke* 2018; 49: 761-  
22 764. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.019771.  
23  
24  
25  
26 42. Thayabaranathan T, Andrew NE, Kilkenny MF, et al. Factors influencing self-  
27 reported anxiety or depression following stroke or TIA using linked registry and  
28 hospital data. *Quality of Life Research* 2018; 27: 3145-3155. DOI: 10.1007/s11136-  
29 018-1960-y.  
30  
31  
32  
33 43. Kim H-Y. Statistical notes for clinical researchers: effect size. *Restor Dent Endod*  
34 2015; 40: 328-331. 2015/10/02. DOI: 10.5395/rde.2015.40.4.328.  
35  
36  
37  
38 44. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Admitted patient care 2017-18: Australian  
39 hospital statistics, (2019).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Online Supplement 1 – Queensland Specific Care Processes**

Care Process	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value
Mobilised during admission	2,876 (69.3)	1,950 (80.1)	<0.001
Swallow screen or assessment	4,952 (74.2)	3,676 (83.5)	<0.001
Aspirin within 48h, if ischaemic	3,393 (68.2)	2,843 (75.8)	<0.001
Discharged on antithrombotic medication, if ischaemic	3,823 (80.1)	2,694 (86.7)	<0.001

For peer review only

## Online Supplement 2 - Co-investigators and other contributors to the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry

The following people are acknowledged for their contribution to collecting hospital data on the patients registered in AuSCR or their participation on various governance committees between 2010 and 2015:

### Steering and Management Committee

**Craig Anderson** PhD (Royal Prince Alfred Hospital NSW, site investigator, The George Institute for Global Health University of New South Wales NSW, The George Institute for Global Health at Peking University Health Science Center China); **Dominique Cadilhac** PhD (Stroke and Ageing Research, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University VIC, Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC, Data Custodian); **Geoffrey Donnan** MD (Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC); **Rohan Grimley** MBBS (Gympie Hospital QLD, Nambour General Hospital QLD, site investigator, Sunshine Coast Clinical School, University of Queensland QLD); **Peter Hand** MBBS, MD, FRACP (Royal Melbourne Hospital VIC, site investigator)

### Steering Committee

**Julie Bernhardt** PhD (The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC); **Paul Bew** MPhy (The Prince Charles Hospital QLD); **Christopher Bladin** MD, MBBS, FRACP (Box Hill Hospital VIC, site investigator); **Greg Cadigan** BN (Queensland State-wide Stroke Clinical Network QLD); **Helen Castley** MBBS (Royal Hobart Hospital Tasmania, site investigator); **Andrew Evans** MBBS (Hons), FRACP (Westmead Hospital NSW); **Susan Hillier** PhD (University of South Australia, SA); **Erin Lalor** PhD (Stroke Foundation VIC); **Andrew Lee** MBBS FRACP (Flinders Medical Centre, South Australia); **Richard Lindley** PhD (The George Institute for Global Health NSW); **Mark Mackay** MBBS, FRACP (Royal Children's Hospital VIC, site investigator); **Sandra Martyn** (Health Statistics Centre Queensland Health QLD); **John McNeil** PhD (Monash University VIC); **Sandy Middleton** PhD (Nursing Research Institute, St Vincent's Health Australia NSW, Australian Catholic University NSW); **Michael Pollack** MBBS, FAFRM (RACP), FACRM, FFPM (ANZCA), MMedSci (Clin Epi) (Hunter Stroke Service NSW); **Mark Simcocks** BSc (VIC, Consumer Representative); **Frances Simmonds** MSc(Med), (Australasian Rehabilitation Outcomes Centre NSW); **Amanda Thrift** PhD (Stroke and Ageing Research, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University VIC); **Andrew Wesseldine** MBBS, FRACP (St John of God Healthcare; Department of Health WA)

### Management Committee

**Helen Dewey** PhD (Austin Hospital VIC, Box Hill Hospital VIC, site investigator, Eastern Health Clinical School, Monash University VIC); **Steven Faux** FAFRM (RACP) (St Vincent's Health Australia NSW); **Kelvin Hill** BAppSci (Stroke Foundation VIC); **Natasha Lannin** PhD (Faculty of Health Sciences, La Trobe University VIC, Occupational Therapy Department, Alfred Health VIC); **Christopher Levi** PhD (Acute Stroke Services, John Hunter Hospital NSW, site investigator); **Christopher Price** BSocW BSc (National Stroke Foundation)

## Site Investigators

**Lauren Arthurson** BSpPath, MHIthServMt (Echuca Regional Health VIC); **Pradeep Bambery** MD, FRCP(G), FRACP (Bundaberg Hospital QLD); **Tim Bates** MBBS, FRACP (Swan District Hospital WA); **Carolyn Beltrame** RN (Div1) (Latrobe Regional Hospital VIC); **David Blacker** MBBS, FRACP (Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital WA); **Ernie Butler** MBBS FRACP (Peninsula Health VIC); **Sean Butler** FIMLS, BM Hons, MRCP(UK), FRACP (Prince Charles Hospital QLD); **Chris Charnley** MBBS (Warrnambool Base Hospital VIC); **Jo Cotterell** BPhysio (Mildura Base Hospital VIC); **Douglas Crompton** MA, PhD, MBBS, FRACP (Northern Hospital VIC); **Vanessa Crosby** Dip Physio (Albury-Wodonga Health VIC); **Carolyn De Wytt** MRCP (UK), MB BCH DUBL, FRACP (Greenslopes Private Hospital QLD); **David Douglas** MBBS, M Admin, FRACGP, FAFRM (RACP) (Ipswich Hospital QLD); **Martin Dunlop** MBBS, FACRM (Cairns Base Hospital QLD); **Paula Easton** BPhy (Hons) (Mackay Hospital QLD); **Sharan Ermel** RN (Div1) (Bendigo Health VIC); **Nisal Gange** MBBS, AMC CERT (Toowoomba Hospital QLD); **Richard Geraghty** MBBS, FRACP (Redcliffe Hospital QLD); **Melissa Gill** BAppSc (SpPath) (Armidale Hospital, NSW); **Graham Hall** MBBS, FRACP (Princess Alexandra Hospital QLD); **Geoffrey Herkes** MBBS, PhD, FRACP (Royal North Shore Hospital NSW); **Karen Hines** BHIM (Caboolture Hospital QLD); **Francis Hishon** RN (Redland Hospital QLD); **James Hughes** BMed, FRACP (Tamworth Hospital NSW); **Joel Iedema** MBBS, FRACP (Redland Hospital QLD); **Martin Jude** MBBS, FRACP (Wagga Wagga Hospital NSW); **Thomas Kraemer** Approbation als Arzt, STATE EXAM MED MUNSTER, FRACP (Ballarat Health Services VIC); **Paul Laird** MBBS, FRACP (Rockhampton Hospital QLD); **Johanna Madden** BPhysio (Goulburn Valley Health VIC); **Graham Mahaffey** RN (Hervey Bay Hospital QLD); **Suzana Milosevic** MD, FRACP, AMC CERT (Logan Hospital QLD); **Peter O'Brien** MBBS, DIP RANZCOG, FRACMA, FACRRM (Warrnambool Hospital VIC); **Trisha Oxley** RN/RM, MANP (Critical Care) (Swan Hill District Health VIC); **Michaela Plante** RN (Div 1) (Rockhampton Hospital QLD); **Juan Rois-Gnecco** Medico Cirujano Javeriana, FAFRM (Ipswich Hospital QLD); **Stephen Read** MBBS, PhD, FRACP (Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital QLD); **Kristen Rowe** BNurs, Cert NeuroSci Nurs (Austin Health VIC); **Fiona Ryan** BAppSc (SpPath), MHIthSc (Orange Hospital and Bathurst Hospitals NSW); **Arman Sabet** MD, FRACP, BSc (Gold Coast Hospital and Robina Hospital QLD); **Noel Saines** MBBS, FRACP (The Wesley Hospital QLD); **Eva Salud** MD, AMC CERT (Gympie Hospital QLD); **Amanda Siller** MBBS, FRACP (Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital QLD); **Christopher Staples** MD (Mater Adults QLD); **Amanda Styles** RN (Div 1) (Armidale Hospital NSW); **Judith Walloscheck** MBA (Bendigo Health VIC); **Richard White** MD, FRCP, FRACP. (Townsville Hospital QLD); **Andrew Wong** MBBS, PhD (Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital QLD); **Lillian Wong** MBBS FRACP (Logan Hospital QLD)

## Staff at The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC

Robin Armstrong, Leonid Churilov, Alison Dias, Kelly Drennan, Adele Gibbs, Brenda Grabsch, Jen Holland, Monique Kilkenny, Joosup Kim, Charlotte Krenus, Francis Kung, Joyce Lim, Karen Moss, Kate Paice, Enna Salama, Sam Shehata, Sabrina Small, Renee Stojanovic, Steven Street, Emma Tod, Kasey Wallis, Julia Watt

## Staff at Monash University VIC

Nadine Andrew

**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	7-8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	11
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	13
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11-14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	2

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Regional Differences in the Care and Outcomes of Acute Stroke Patients in Australia: an Observational Study using Evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR)

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040418.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Oct-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Dwyer, Mitchell; University of Tasmania Faculty of Health, Francis, Karen; University of Tasmania Faculty of Health Peterson, Gregory; University of Tasmania, School of Pharmacy Ford, Karen; Royal Hobart Hospital, Centre of Education and Research Nursing and Midwifery Gall, Seana; University of Tasmania Phan, Hoang ; University of Tasmania, Menzies Institute for Medical Research; Pham Ngoc Thach University of Medicine, Department of Public Health Management Castley, Helen; Royal Hobart Hospital Wong, Lillian; Princess Alexandra Hospital White, Richard; Townsville Hospital Ryan, Fiona; New South Wales Department of Health Arthurson, Lauren; Echuca Regional Health Kim, Joosup; Monash University, Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences Cadilhac, Dominique; Monash University, Medicine Lannin, Natasha; Monash University Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Sciences, Neuroscience
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Neurology
Keywords:	Stroke medicine < INTERNAL MEDICINE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.



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

## Regional Differences in the Care and Outcomes of Acute Stroke Patients in Australia: an Observational Study using Evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR)

Mitchell Dwyer<sup>1</sup>, Karen Francis<sup>1</sup>, Gregory M. Peterson<sup>1</sup>, Karen M. Ford<sup>1,2</sup>, Seana Gall<sup>1</sup>, Hoang T. Phan<sup>1</sup>, Helen Castley<sup>2</sup>, Lillian Wong<sup>3</sup>, Richard White<sup>4</sup>, Fiona Ryan<sup>5</sup>, Lauren Arthurson<sup>6</sup>, Joosup Kim<sup>7,8</sup>, Dominique A. Cadilhac<sup>7,8\*</sup>, Natasha A. Lannin<sup>9,10\*</sup> on behalf of the AuSCR consortium.

\*equally contributed as senior authors

### Affiliations:

1. College of Health and Medicine, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
2. Royal Hobart Hospital, Tasmanian Health Service, Hobart, Australia
3. Princess Alexandra Hospital, Metro South Health, Brisbane, Australia
4. Townsville Hospital and Health Service, Townsville, Australia
5. Western New South Wales Local Health District, Australia
6. Echuca Regional Health, Echuca, Australia
7. Stroke and Ageing Research, Department of Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University, Clayton, Australia
8. Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Heidelberg, University of Melbourne, Australia
9. Alfred Health, Prahran, Australia
10. Department of Neuroscience, Central Clinical School, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

### ORCID IDs

Mitchell Dwyer	0000-0002-9956-2569
Karen Francis	0000-0003-3578-2498
Gregory M. Peterson	0000-0002-6764-3882
Karen M. Ford	0000-0003-2834-721X
Seana Gall	0000-0002-5138-2526
Hoang T. Phan	0000-0003-0506-2924
Helen Castley	N/A
Lillian Wong	0000-0003-1579-4109
Richard White	N/A
Fiona Ryan	N/A
Lauren Arthurson	N/A
Joosup Kim	0000-0002-4079-0428
Dominique A. Cadilhac	0000-0001-8162-682X
Natasha A. Lannin	0000-0002-2066-8345

**Word count:** 2,920



## Tables

Table 1. Patient characteristics by region

Table 2. Processes of care by region

Table 3. Survival analysis of stroke patients by region

Table 4. HRQoL at 90-180 day follow-up by region

**Key terms:** Stroke, care, healthcare disparities, health services accessibility, hospitalisation, urban health, rural health, outcome assessment (health care)

**Funding statement:** AuSCR was supported by grants from the NHMRC (1034415), Monash University<sup>†</sup>, Queensland Health<sup>†</sup>, Stroke Foundation<sup>†</sup>, Allergan<sup>†</sup>, Ipsen<sup>†</sup>, and Boehringer Ingelheim<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Award/grant numbers are not applicable

### Author for correspondence:

Professor Natasha A. Lannin

Department of Neuroscience, Central Clinical School, Monash University

Level 6 Alfred Centre, 99 Commercial Road, Melbourne, VIC 3004 Australia.

Phone: +61 (3) 99 030 795

E-mail: natasha.lannin@monash.edu

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To compare the processes and outcomes of care in patients with stroke treated in urban versus rural hospitals in Australia.

**Design:** Observational study using data from a multicentre national registry.

**Setting:** Data from 50 acute care hospitals in Australia (25 urban, 25 rural) which participated in the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry during the period 2010 to 2015.

**Participants:** Patients were divided into two groups (urban, rural) according to the Australian Standard Geographical Classification Remoteness Area classification. Data pertaining to 28,115 stroke patients were analysed, of whom 8,159 (29%) were admitted to hospitals located within rural areas.

**Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures:** Regional differences in processes of care (admission to a stroke unit, thrombolysis for ischaemic stroke, discharge on anti-hypertensive medication, and the provision of a care plan). Survival analyses up to 180 days and health-related quality of life at 90-180 days.

**Results:** Compared to those admitted to urban hospitals, patients in rural hospitals less often received thrombolysis (urban 12.7% vs rural 7.5%,  $p<0.001$ ) or received treatment in stroke units (urban 82.2% vs 76.5%,  $p<0.001$ ), and fewer were discharged with a care plan (urban 61.3% vs 44.7%,  $p<0.001$ ). No significant differences were found in terms of survival or overall self-reported quality of life.

**Conclusions:** Rural access to recommended components of acute stroke care was comparatively poorer; however, this did not appear to impact health outcomes at approximately 6 months.

## Article Summary

### *Strengths and Limitations of this Study*

- This is the first study in Australia to look at how access to acute stroke care varies between Australia's urban and rural areas, using data from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR).
- This study also reports on regional differences in patient outcomes, in the form of mortality and health-related quality of life (HRQoL) at up to 180 days post-stroke.
- Patient outcome measures were adjusted for known confounders.
- Hospitals participating in the AuSCR may not be representative of all Australian hospitals.

## Introduction

Internationally, evidence suggests that patients with stroke admitted to hospitals located in rural or regional areas have limited access to known evidence-based interventions, such as thrombolysis and stroke unit care, relative to those treated in urban hospitals.<sup>1</sup> There is a paucity of research investigating disparities in other, more elementary processes which define contemporary standards of acute stroke care, such as the prescription of secondary prevention medications. In addition, if there are differences in stroke care between urban and rural regions, determining if there are corresponding differences in patient outcomes warrants attention so as to permit future exploration of organisational, process or patient barriers preventing evidence-based stroke care being received.

Overall, prior research on the rural and urban outcomes of care has yielded inconsistent findings,<sup>1</sup> and is characterised by studies with inadequate risk adjustment,<sup>2-4</sup> or an indirect focus on urban-rural differences in outcomes.<sup>5-7</sup> Previous attempts to explore this issue have also been reliant on ‘hard’ outcome measures such as rates of mortality and readmission;<sup>8-10</sup> whereas regional differences in patients’ quality of life has been rarely investigated.<sup>11,12</sup> Given this knowledge gap, the aim of this study was to compare the processes of care and outcomes for patients with stroke treated in urban compared with rural hospitals.

## Methods

### *Study design*

We undertook a multicentre observational cohort study of adults admitted to hospital with acute stroke using linked data from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR) (see protocol<sup>13</sup> and [www.auscr.com.au](http://www.auscr.com.au)). The AuSCR is used to monitor processes of care provided to, and the outcomes of, individuals hospitalised with acute stroke or transient ischaemic

1  
2  
3 attacks (TIAs) in Australian hospitals primary for quality improvement and benchmarking  
4 activities.<sup>13</sup> Cases are entered prospectively in the AuSCR based on clinical diagnosis of  
5 stroke during the admission. Case ascertainment is checked annually using International  
6 Classification of Diseases (ICD)-10 discharge codes obtained from the hospital  
7 administrative system and compared to the cases entered in the registry at each hospital. A  
8 complete list of co-investigators and other contributors to the AuSCR is contained in online  
9 supplement 1. Death information (date and cause) from Australia's National Death Index  
10 (NDI) are routinely linked to the AuSCR by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare  
11 (AIHW).<sup>14</sup> For this study, we used data from all 50 hospitals who submitted data to the  
12 AuSCR from January 2010 to December 2015. Patients diagnosed with TIAs were excluded  
13 from the analyses, as these individuals are unlikely to require the care processes of interest in  
14 this study. As at 2015, the 50 hospitals covered by the AuSCR accounted for approximately  
15 46% of all Australian hospitals receiving  $n \geq 50$  stroke admissions per annum.<sup>15</sup> Selection bias  
16 is minimised in the AuSCR by use of an "opt-out" approach when recruiting participants,  
17 whereby all eligible patients are registered unless they or their next of kin nominates to have  
18 their data excluded.<sup>13</sup> The proportion of cases who opt-out from the registry is <3% in urban  
19 and rural hospitals. Patients who did not opt out of the registry, and who were discharged  
20 from hospital following their stroke, were followed up by trained research staff between 90  
21 and 180 days following their index admission (i.e. the first registered event in AuSCR). This  
22 process uses a modified Dillman protocol,<sup>16</sup> whereby two attempts are made to contact  
23 patients by post prior to an attempt by telephone.<sup>17</sup>

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

Process of care data collected in AuSCR up to 2015 were: admission to a stroke unit, thrombolysis (ischaemic stroke only), discharge on anti-hypertensive medication, and the provision of a care plan. Care plans are developed with the patient and family if discharged from acute care directly to the community (i.e., to a home setting or institutional residential

1  
2  
3 aged care and not transferred to another hospital, that is, for rehabilitation). This is not the  
4  
5 discharge summary written by hospital clinicians for the primary care doctor; the discharge  
6  
7 care plan should include information to improve the transition to home, such as arrangements  
8  
9 for community support services, information on risk factor management, equipment to be  
10  
11 purchased, and follow-up appointments. Hospitals located in the state of Queensland also  
12  
13 collected four additional variables: time to first mobilisation, dysphagia screen, aspirin within  
14  
15 48 hours, and being discharged on antiplatelets or antithrombotics if an ischemic event.  
16  
17 Indicator data with responses of no, unknown, or missing were recoded as negative  
18  
19 (proportion of missing data ranged from <1% to 5.05%). Regional differences in patient  
20  
21 mortality were assessed using intervals of 7, 30, 90 and 180 days.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Participants' health-related quality of life (HRQoL) data were collected at 90-180 day follow-  
30  
31 up using the EuroQoL-5 dimension-3 level (EQ-5D-3L) instrument.<sup>18</sup> Respondents were  
32  
33 asked to report their health status in five domains (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain or  
34  
35 discomfort, and anxiety or depression) with each domain having three possible responses (no  
36  
37 problems, some problems, and extreme problems). Respondents use a Visual Analogue Scale  
38  
39 (VAS) to rate their overall perceived health from 0 to 100, with 0 being the worst imaginable  
40  
41 health state and 100 the best imaginable health state.<sup>18</sup> The VAS was coded as 0 for  
42  
43 individuals who had died within the follow-up period.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 ***Statistical analysis***

51  
52 The primary exposure variable of interest was classification of hospital (urban versus rural),  
53  
54 and the primary outcomes were survival analyses up to 180 days was health related quality of  
55  
56 life as assessed on the EQ-5D-3L. Hospitals were divided into categories of 'urban' or 'rural'  
57  
58 based on their classification under the Australian Standard Geographical Classification  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Remoteness Area (ASGC-RA) system.<sup>19</sup> The ASGC-RA system classifies areas into five  
4 categories: major cities, inner regional, outer regional, remote or very remote.<sup>19</sup> For the  
5 purpose of this study, hospitals located in ASGC-RA category 1 (i.e. major cities) were  
6 regarded as 'urban', while those in categories 2 or above were regarded as 'rural'. Interactive  
7 maps with overlays of the RA categories can be accessed via the Australian Bureau of  
8 Statistics website.<sup>20</sup> The majority of hospitals (>95%) that contribute data to AuSCR are  
9 funded under the public health care scheme. Participants' baseline characteristics were  
10 compared between regions using  $\chi^2$  tests for categorical data, and Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests  
11 for continuous variables. Care processes were expressed as the proportion of eligible patients  
12 who received each form of care and were analysed by location (urban or rural) using  $\chi^2$  tests.  
13  
14 Participants' responses to the EQ-5D-3L instrument were expressed as the number of  
15 individuals who encountered problems with each domain, with 'some problems' and  
16 'extreme problems' being recoded into one category. Regional differences within each  
17 domain were then analysed using  $\chi^2$  tests.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Cox proportional hazards regression analysis was conducted to assess deaths within 7, 30, 90,  
39 and 180 days. Logistic regression was used to assess regional differences in each of the EQ-  
40 5D-3L domains. Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke,  
41 ability to walk on admission (as a validated measure of stroke severity)<sup>21</sup> and socioeconomic  
42 status (SES) using the index of relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage  
43 (IRSAD).<sup>22</sup> Each regression model also accounted for inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital  
44 stroke, and whether the individual received treatment in a stroke unit. Patient clustering was  
45 adjusted for directly in each of our models, to account for correlation between patients  
46 admitted to the same hospital. A sensitivity analysis was undertaken using datasets where  
47 inter-hospital transfers were excluded, to assess the potential impact of this variable on  
48 patient outcomes. Data were analysed using Stata/SE 12.<sup>23</sup>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### ***Ethical approval***

All participating hospitals have provided ethical and governance approvals for AuSCR data collection and analysis. Ethical approval was obtained from the AIHW to conduct data linkage to the NDI, and from the Tasmanian Human Research Ethics Committee to conduct this data analysis (reference H0017787).

### **Results**

Between 2010 and 2015, 28,115 episodes of care from 50 hospitals were registered in the AuSCR. Of these episodes, 8,159 (29%) were for individuals admitted to hospitals located within rural areas. Compared to those from urban areas, individuals from rural areas were more likely to have been born in Australia, have an indigenous background, and be of a lower SES (Table 1). Rural patients were also more likely than urban patients to be diagnosed with a stroke of ‘undetermined’ subtype (8.1% vs 3.6%). When compared to urban patients, those treated in rural hospitals had poorer access to several clinical processes of care (Table 2, online supplement 2 for variables collected only in Queensland). Specifically, rural patients were less likely to be admitted to a stroke unit (odds ratio [OR] = 0.70, 95% Confidence Interval [CI] 0.66 to 0.74), receive intravenous thrombolysis in ischaemic stroke (OR = 0.55, 95% CI 0.50 to 0.62), or be provided with a care plan at time of discharge (OR = 0.59, 95% CI 0.54 to 0.64). There were no significant differences between regions in prescribing rates of anti-hypertensive medications at discharge (OR = 0.97, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.03). Regional differences in the proportion of patients discharged home were not observed, but urban patients were more likely to die in hospital in the unadjusted comparisons (Table 2). The median LOS for rural patients was one day shorter than that of urban patients, and this



remained the case after adjustment for potential confounders (coefficient -1, 95% CI -1.97 to -0.03).

**Table 1. Patient characteristics by region**

Characteristics	Urban n (%)	Rural n (%)	p-value
No. of sites	25 (50)	25 (50)	
No. of cases	19,956 (71)	8,159 (29)	
Female	9,095 (45.6)	3,770 (46.2)	0.335
<b>Age (years)</b>			
<65	4,910 (24.6)	2,095 (25.7)	0.030
65-74	4,468 (22.4)	1,887 (23.1)	
75-84	6,141 (30.8)	2,469 (30.3)	
85+	4,431 (22.2)	1,707 (20.9)	
Median age in years (Q1, Q3) <sup>a</sup>	76.1 (65.2, 84.2)	75.4 (64.7, 83.6)	0.003
<b>State</b>			
New South Wales	3,252 (16.3)	805 (9.9)	<0.001
Queensland	6,675 (33.4)	4,401 (53.9)	
Tasmania	-	1,118 (13.7)	
Victoria	9,133 (45.8)	1,835 (22.5)	
Western Australia	896 (4.5)	-	
Born in Australia	11,916 (59.7)	6,282 (77)	<0.001
Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander	174 (0.9)	262 (3.2)	<0.001
<b>Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage</b>			
Quintile 1 (most disadvantaged)	2,367 (12.3)	2,557 (34.4)	<0.001
Quintile 2	2,764 (14.3)	1,932 (26)	
Quintile 3	3,335 (17.3)	1,603 (21.6)	
Quintile 4	4,837 (25.1)	1,092 (14.7)	
Quintile 5 (most advantaged)	5,986 (31)	244 (3.3)	
Able to walk on admission (stroke severity)	6,055 (32.7)	2,439 (34.6)	0.003
<b>Stroke subtype</b>			
Intracerebral haemorrhagic	3,247 (16.3)	1,177 (14.4)	<0.001
Ischaemic	15,962 (80.1)	6,313 (77.5)	
Undetermined	709 (3.6)	658 (8.1)	
Transfer from other hospitals	2,191 (11.2)	1,739 (21.6)	<0.001
In-hospital stroke	1,156 (5.9)	407 (5.1)	0.008
Length of stay, median (Q1, Q3) <sup>a</sup> days	6 (3-10)	5 (2-8)	<0.001
Died in hospital <sup>b</sup>	2,216 (11.3)	720 (9.5)	<0.001
<b>Discharge destination</b>			
Home	7,353 (41.4)	2,899 (39)	0.092
Rehabilitation	6,234 (35.1)	2,137 (28.7)	<0.001
Aged care	1,057 (6)	326 (4.4)	<0.001
Other	3,096 (17.5)	2,077 (27.9)	<0.001
<b>EQ-5D-dimensions</b>			
<b>Mobility</b>			
No problems	4,171 (47.1)	1,791 (48.4)	
Some problems	4,056 (45.8)	1,714 (46.4)	

Extreme problems	631 (7.1)	193 (5.2)	<0.001
Self-care			
No problems	5,784 (65.2)	2,499 (67.4)	
Some problems	2,012 (22.7)	872 (23.5)	
Extreme problems	1,069 (12.1)	339 (9.1)	<0.001
Usual activities			
No problems	3,445 (38.9)	1,448 (39.1)	
Some problems	3,590 (40.6)	1,571 (42.3)	
Extreme problems	1,809 (20.5)	688 (18.6)	0.034
Pain/discomfort			
No problems	4,401 (50)	1,876 (50.9)	
Some problems	3,955 (44.9)	1,622 (44)	
Extreme problems	446 (5.1)	190 (5.1)	0.621
Anxiety/depression			
No problems	4,632 (52.8)	1,948 (52.9)	
Some problems	3,630 (41.3)	1,527 (41.5)	
Extreme problems	518 (5.9)	208 (5.6)	0.860

<sup>a</sup>Q1: 25th percentile; Q3: 75th percentile

<sup>b</sup><5% missing/not documented data.

**Table 2. Processes of care by region**

	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value
<i>Evidence-based therapies (all states)</i>			
Treated in a stroke unit	16,408 (82.2)	6,241 (76.5)	<0.001
Intravenous thrombolysis for ischaemic stroke	2,007 (12.7)	463 (7.5)	<0.001
Discharged on antihypertensives	12,184 (70.6)	4,895 (69.9)	0.315
Care plan on discharge to community	4,871 (61.3)	1,441 (44.7)	<0.001

There were no significant differences between geographical groups in terms of survival up to 180 days (Table 3). In relation to HRQoL, no regional differences were observed in four of the EQ-5D domains, namely Anxiety/Depression, Mobility, Self-care, and Usual Activities (Table 4). Rural patients were, however, significantly less likely to have reported symptoms of pain or discomfort during the follow up period (OR = 0.88, 95% CI 0.79 to 0.97,  $p = 0.015$ ). Rural patients also had marginally higher perceived health, as measured by VAS, than their urban counterparts (70 vs 68,  $p < 0.001$ ). The sensitivity analysis that excluded transferred patients did not influence the results.

**Table 3. Survival analysis of rural stroke patients as compared to urban stroke patients**

Time to death	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value	Model*	
				HR	95% CI
Up to 7 days	1,750 (8.8)	769 (9.4)	0.081	0.98	(0.79-1.21)
8 to 30 days	1,242 (6.2)	491 (6)	0.608	1.02	(0.87-1.20)
31 to 90 days	745 (3.7)	265 (3.2)	0.055	0.88	(0.73-1.06)
91 to 180 days	526 (2.6)	202 (2.5)	0.439	0.88	(0.69-1.11)

\*Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke, ability to walk on admission, socioeconomic status, inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital stroke, and stroke unit admission

**Table 4. Outcomes at 90-180 day follow-up of rural patients as compared to urban patients**

EQ-5D-dimensions	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value	Model		
				OR	95% CI	p-value
Mobility	4,687 (52.9)	1,907 (51.6)	0.169	1.02	(0.92-1.13)	0.717
Self-care	3,081 (34.8)	1,211 (32.6)	0.023	0.92	(0.80-1.06)	0.235
Usual activities	5,399 (61)	2,259 (60.9)	0.910	0.95	(0.85-1.06)	0.376
Pain/discomfort	4,401 (50)	1,812 (49.1)	0.376	0.88	(0.79-0.97)	0.015
Anxiety/depression	4,148 (47.2)	1,735 (47.1)	0.890	0.98	(0.87-1.10)	0.759
<b>Median VAS (Q1, Q3)</b>	68 (40, 80)	70 (50, 83)	<.001	-	-	-

\*Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke, ability to walk on admission, socioeconomic status, inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital stroke, and stroke unit admission

## Discussion

The primary aim of this study was to assess whether there are differences in the quality of care and outcomes for patients treated in urban and rural locations. We found that patients admitted to rural hospitals in Australia were less likely to receive some key care processes that are recommended in our national stroke clinical guidelines.<sup>24</sup> However, for the most part, we did not observe corresponding differences in patient 90-180 day outcomes.

1  
2  
3 Patients admitted to rural hospitals were significantly less likely to receive treatment in a  
4 stroke unit (76.5% vs 82.2%) despite only one rural hospital not being equipped with a stroke  
5 unit (n=30 episodes of care). This finding suggests that while nearly all rural sites had  
6 facilities which met the minimum criteria for stroke units,<sup>25</sup> many were unable to utilise their  
7 stroke unit's full potential. As observed by Dwyer et al.,<sup>26</sup> hospitals without 'quarantined'  
8 stroke unit beds may be unable to offer specialist care to stroke patients at times when there is  
9 demand for beds from other medical specialties. Such hospitals may benefit from using  
10 clinical coordinators to facilitate organisational change, as recommended by Cadilhac and  
11 colleagues.<sup>27</sup>  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 It should be noted that during the study period only 45% of patients located in Australia's  
27 'regional' areas received treatment in a stroke unit, and only 3.3% of all stroke unit beds were  
28 located in regional areas.<sup>28,29</sup> Taken together, these statistics indicate that access to stroke  
29 units within rural hospitals participating in the AuSCR was markedly better than the national  
30 average. Given that there is a well-established link between stroke unit admission and access  
31 to key aspects of acute stroke care,<sup>30</sup> future efforts should focus on increasing the number of  
32 stroke units within Australia's regional areas, and improving access to existing stroke units.  
33 Adherence rates in the current study were, for the most part, representative of that of more  
34 recent stroke care audits in Australia.<sup>31,32</sup> The main exception was in rates of care plan  
35 provision; on average 53% of patients in the current study received this form of care, which  
36 was substantially lower than that of AuSCR data from 2018 (69%)<sup>32</sup> and data from the Stroke  
37 Foundation's 2019 Acute Audit (65%).<sup>31</sup>  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Consistent with other studies, rural patients remained less likely than urban patients to be  
57 administered thrombolysis. The provision of thrombolysis is known to be influenced by a  
58 host of patient, clinician and system-related factors.<sup>33</sup> Of these factors, patients' distance to  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 hospitals, accessing brain imaging after-hours, and obtaining specialist input are among the  
4 most pertinent issues encountered by clinicians providing thrombolysis in rural areas.<sup>34-36</sup>

5  
6  
7 Rural-based clinicians in the Australian state of Victoria have been able to obtain specialist  
8 input and improve thrombolysis rates through the use of a telemedicine program.<sup>37</sup> Such a  
9  
10 system was implemented in the state of Victoria for a small part of the study period,<sup>37</sup> and as  
11  
12 such, may have influenced adherence rates in this group of hospitals. The use of telemedicine  
13  
14 technology in all regional areas of the country is urgently needed in order to increase rates of  
15  
16 thrombolysis administration.<sup>38</sup>

17  
18  
19 We did not observe differences by location in rates of prescription for antihypertensive  
20  
21 medications at hospital discharge. As has been noted previously,<sup>39</sup> this may reflect the fact  
22  
23 that the management of patients' blood pressure for primary or secondary prevention is not  
24  
25 necessarily specific to stroke, and does not require any additional resources. In any case, the  
26  
27 rates of prescription for antihypertensive medications at discharge from both regions were  
28  
29 substantially less than expected based on previous AuSCR data, indicating that more work  
30  
31 needs to be done to improve this aspect of evidence-based care.<sup>40</sup>

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Despite marked differences in access to stroke unit care and thrombolysis, we did not observe  
43  
44 any regional differences in rates of survival at up to 180 days post-stroke. This may be  
45  
46 because access to acute stroke care, when considered in its entirety, was reasonably  
47  
48 comparable between the study's urban and rural hospitals. This notion is supported by the  
49  
50 fact that the study's rural hospitals, by virtue of their participation in the registry, are likely to  
51  
52 be highly motivated to monitor and improve their provision of stroke care, and perhaps are  
53  
54 better resourced than other rural sites. Furthermore, there is evidence that within the state of  
55  
56 Queensland (online supplement 2) patients in rural hospitals were provided evidence-based  
57  
58 therapies more often than those in urban hospitals. These differences warrant further research.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 In relation to HRQoL, we observed that with the exception of the pain/discomfort domain,  
7  
8 there were no significant regional differences in any of the EQ-5D domains or VAS scores.  
9  
10 These findings stand in contrast to multiple surveys conducted by the Australian government,  
11  
12 in which rural residents had an overall lower self-reported health status.<sup>41,42</sup> The disparity  
13  
14 between regions in terms of self-reported pain/discomfort may point towards regional  
15  
16 differences in attitudes towards pain management. Indeed, literature on cancer patients in  
17  
18 Australia has highlighted that a culture of stoicism and self-reliance within rural areas can  
19  
20 make individuals less likely to report symptoms of pain<sup>43</sup> and delay seeking medical  
21  
22 assistance.<sup>44</sup> There are other demographic factors which may partially explain this finding.  
23  
24 For instance, previous researchers using the AuSCR data have found that patients with stroke  
25  
26 requiring an interpreter are more likely to report symptoms of pain.<sup>45</sup> Given that urban  
27  
28 patients in this study were far less likely to have been born in Australia (i.e. 59.7% vs 77%),  
29  
30 the impact of the respondents' English-speaking ability on our findings cannot be discounted.  
31  
32 Previous research using the AuSCR data has also highlighted that, other factors remaining  
33  
34 equal, younger people from a lower SES are more likely to report symptoms of  
35  
36 anxiety/depression.<sup>46</sup> We also found that rural patients had a significantly higher perceived  
37  
38 health status than urban patients (70 vs 68 via VAS); however, it is unlikely that this  
39  
40 difference represents a clinically relevant finding.<sup>47</sup>  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Our study design and data have several limitations. Firstly, the distribution of urban and rural  
50  
51 patients in this study (71% vs 29%) may not reflect that of the broader Australian hospital  
52  
53 population, which recently stood at 64% and 36%, respectively.<sup>48</sup> We also did not use any  
54  
55 data in relation to participants' residential addresses. It is therefore possible that some  
56  
57 individuals who were admitted to urban hospitals resided in rural areas, and vice versa. A  
58  
59 further limitation is that our HRQoL data did not factor in patients' health prior to their  
60

1  
2  
3 stroke, meaning it is possible that some individuals' HRQoL deficits may relate to pre-  
4 existing conditions. Lastly, although we used patients' baseline walking ability as a validated  
5 measure of stroke severity,<sup>21</sup> the study may have benefited from the use of a more recognised  
6 scale, such as the NIHSS. Despite these limitations, our study is the first of its kind in  
7 Australia to comprehensively examine urban-rural differences in access to acute stroke care  
8 and the associated patient outcomes. To the best of the authors' knowledge, it is also among  
9 the first in the world to report on urban-rural differences in patients' quality of life post-  
10 stroke.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **Conclusions**

25  
26 This is the largest study to date examining geographic disparities in processes of stroke care,  
27 and providing a benchmark for the development and testing of interventions that may have  
28 the potential to reduce the differences between rural and urban patients with acute stroke.  
29 Interestingly, while we identified disparities in processes of care, we did not observe any  
30 association between geographic region and patient outcomes in terms of mortality or HRQoL.  
31 There are clear opportunities to better understand why the impact of these process of care  
32 variables on stroke outcomes are more pronounced in urban areas. Our findings underscore  
33 the importance of understanding how geographical area influences HRQoL; continued efforts  
34 to determine the impact of stroke care post-discharge are important. Future work in this field  
35 should also focus on redressing the resourcing disparities, in particular increasing the number  
36 of rural hospitals which meet the minimum criteria for stroke unit care.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

## 53 **Declaration of competing interests**

54  
55 DAC is the data custodian for the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry and is supported by a  
56 National Health and Medical Research Council fellowship (1154273). She has received  
57 grants paid to her institution from Stroke Foundation, Melbourne Health, Victorian  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 government, Queensland government, Tasmanian government, South Australian government,  
4  
5 Western Australian government, Boehringer Ingelheim, Medtronic, Pfizer, Amgen and Shire.  
6  
7 NAL is the Chair of the Management Committee of the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry,  
8  
9 and a member of the Stroke Foundation Clinical Council. NAL is supported by National  
10  
11 Heart Foundation of Australia (GNT102055).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 **Author Contributions**

18  
19  
20 HC, MD, GP, SG, KMF, KF and DC contributed to the study design and concept. JK and DC  
21  
22 contributed towards the statistical analyses. HTP, HC, LW, RW, FR, and LA participated in  
23  
24 the manuscript preparation, editing and revision and agreed upon the final version of the  
25  
26 paper. NL contributed to the interpretation of results and was heavily involved in the final  
27  
28 preparation of the paper.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 **Data sharing statement:** contact can be made with the corresponding author for queries  
36  
37 relating to unpublished data.  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 **Patient and Public Involvement:** patients and/or the public were not directly involved in the  
43  
44 design, recruitment or implementation of the study. Consumer representatives are members  
45  
46 of the AuSCR Steering Committee, and regular reviews by consumers of the AuSCR  
47  
48 documents (policies and reports) are undertaken.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## References

1. Dwyer M, Rehman S, Ottavi T, et al. Urban-rural differences in the care and outcomes of acute stroke patients: systematic review. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2018; 397: 63-74.
2. Fleet R, Bussi eres S, Tounkara FK, et al. Rural versus urban academic hospital mortality following stroke in Canada. *PloS One* 2018; 13: e0191151.
3. Harnod D, Choi W-M, Chang R-E, et al. Are major medical centers better for stroke and myocardial infarction patients in Taiwan? A nationwide population-based study. *International Journal of Gerontology* 2010; 4: 137-142.
4. Lichtman JH, Leifheit-Limson EC, Jones SB, et al. 30-day risk-standardized mortality and readmission rates after ischemic stroke in critical access hospitals. *Stroke* 2012; 43: 2741-2747.
5. Borhani-Haghighi A, Safari R, Heydari ST, et al. Hospital mortality associated with stroke in southern Iran. *Iranian Journal of Medical Sciences* 2013; 38: 314.
6. Hemphill JC, 3rd, Newman J, Zhao S, et al. Hospital usage of early do-not-resuscitate orders and outcome after intracerebral hemorrhage. *Stroke* 2004; 35: 1130-1134. DOI: 10.1161/01.STR.0000125858.71051.ca.
7. Ido MS, Bayakly R, Frankel M, et al. Administrative data linkage to evaluate a quality improvement program in acute stroke care, Georgia, 2006-2009. *Preventing Chronic Disease* 2015; 12: E05. DOI: 10.5888/pcd12.140238.
8. Kilkenny MF, Dewey HM, Sundararajan V, et al. Readmissions after stroke: linked data from the Australian stroke clinical registry and hospital databases. *Med J Aust* 2015; 203: 102-106.
9. Saposnik G, Baibergenova A, O'Donnell M, et al. Hospital volume and stroke outcome Does it matter? *Neurology* 2007; 69: 1142-1151.

10. Thompson MP, Zhao X, Bekelis K, et al. Regional variation in 30-day ischemic stroke outcomes for medicare beneficiaries treated in Get With The Guidelines–Stroke hospitals. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* 2017; 10. DOI: 10.1161/circoutcomes.117.003604.
11. Santos NMF, Tavares DMS and Dias FA. Quality of life comparasion of elderly urban and rural stroke victims. *Revista de Pesquisa: Cuidado é Fundamental Online* 2014; 6: 387-397.
12. Nuttaset Manimmanakorn M, Vichiansiri R, Nuntharuksa C, et al. Quality of life after stroke rehabilitation among urban vs. rural patients in Thailand. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2008; 9: 394-399.
13. Cadilhac DA, Lannin NA, Anderson CS, et al. Protocol and pilot data for establishing the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry. *International Journal of Stroke* 2010; 5: 217-226.
14. Cadilhac DA, Kilkenny MF, Levi CR, et al. Risk-adjusted hospital mortality rates for stroke: evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR). *Med J Aust* 2017; 206: 345-350.
15. National Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit: Acute Services Report 2015, <https://informme.org.au/en/stroke-data/Acute-audits> (2015).
16. Dillman DA. The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual review of sociology* 1991; 17: 225-249.
17. Lannin NA, Anderson C, Lim J, et al. Telephone follow-up was more expensive but more efficient than postal in a national stroke registry. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013; 66: 896-902.
18. Group TE. EuroQol-a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health policy* 1990; 16: 199-208.

- 1  
2  
3 19. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Standard Geographical Classification  
4 (ASGC),  
5  
6  
7  
8 <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/8B8ABC8EC6>  
9  
10 [2D8F46CA2570AE00DD3B5?opendocument](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/8B8ABC8EC6) (2011).  
11
- 12 20. Statistics ABo. ABS Maps, <https://itt.abs.gov.au/itt/r.jsp?ABSMaps> (2020).  
13
- 14 21. Counsell C, Dennis M, McDowall M, et al. Predicting outcome after acute and  
15 subacute stroke. *Stroke* 2002; 33: 1041-1047.  
16
- 17 22. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA),  
18  
19 <https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2033.0.55.001Main+Features>  
20  
21 [12016?OpenDocument](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2033.0.55.001Main+Features) (2018).  
22  
23
- 24 23. StataCorp L. Stata data analysis and statistical Software. *Special Edition Release*  
25  
26 2007; 10: 733.  
27
- 28 24. Stroke Foundation. Clinical Guidelines for Stroke Management,  
29  
30 <https://informme.org.au/en/Guidelines/Clinical-Guidelines-for-Stroke-Management>  
31  
32 (2020).  
33
- 34 25. Stroke Foundation. Acute Stroke Services Framework,  
35  
36 <https://strokefoundation.org.au/->  
37  
38 [/media/E6682A70FFF0489FA66D28042C0FF472.ashx?la=en](https://strokefoundation.org.au/-/media/E6682A70FFF0489FA66D28042C0FF472.ashx?la=en) (2019).  
39  
40
- 41 26. Dwyer M. Health care providers' perceptions of factors that influence the provision of  
42 acute stroke care in urban and rural settings: a qualitative study [thesis chapter].  
43  
44 *Regional Differences in Acute Stroke Care and Patient Outcomes*. Hobart, Australia:  
45 University of Tasmania, 2020.  
46  
47
- 48 27. Cadilhac DA, Purvis T, Kilkenny MF, et al. Evaluation of Rural Stroke Services Does  
49  
50 Implementation of Coordinators and Pathways Improve Care in Rural Hospitals?  
51  
52 *Stroke* 2013; 44: 2848-2853.  
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
28. Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit Acute Services Report (2017),  
<https://informme.org.au/en/stroke-data/Acute-audits>.
  29. National Stroke Foundation. Clinical Audit: Organisational Survey Report 2013,  
<https://informme.org.au/-/media/E427FAC31B934527BDA5F35CC7DEB699.ashx?la=en> (2013).
  30. Stroke Unit Trialists Collaboration. Organised inpatient (stroke unit) care for stroke.  
*Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013; 11. DOI:  
10.1002/14651858.CD000197.pub3.
  31. Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit: Acute Services Report 2019,  
<https://informme.org.au/-/media/0DAA2643E8F7424C84D384EB16CF0716.ashx?la=en> (2019).
  32. Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR). Annual Report,  
<https://auscr2.files.wordpress.com/2020/03/auscr-2018-annual-report-final.pdf> (2018).
  33. Baatiema L, Otim ME, Mnatzaganian G, et al. Health professionals' views on the barriers and enablers to evidence-based practice for acute stroke care: a systematic review. *Implementation Science* 2017; 12: 74.
  34. Kapral M, Hall R, Gozdyra P, et al. Geographic access to stroke care services in rural communities in Ontario, Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Neurological Sciences* 2020; 47: 301-308.
  35. Moloczij N, Mosley I, Moss K, et al. Is telemedicine helping or hindering the delivery of stroke thrombolysis in rural areas? A qualitative analysis. *Internal Medicine Journal* 2015; 45: 957-964.
  36. Joubert J, Prentice LF, Moulin T, et al. Stroke in rural areas and small communities. *Stroke* 2008; 39: 1920-1928.

- 1  
2  
3 37. Bladin CF, Kim J, Bagot KL, et al. Improving acute stroke care in regional hospitals:  
4 clinical evaluation of the Victorian Stroke Telemedicine program. *Medical Journal of*  
5 *Australia* 2020; 212: 371-377. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50570.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 38. Lindley RI. Telemedicine is improving outcomes for patients with stroke. *The*  
11 *Medical journal of Australia* 2020; 212: 364-365. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50587.  
12  
13  
14 39. Koifman J, Hall R, Li S, et al. The association between rural residence and stroke care  
15 and outcomes. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2016; 363: 16-20. DOI:  
16 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2016.02.019>.  
17  
18  
19  
20 40. Dalli LL, Kim J, Thrift AG, et al. Disparities in Antihypertensive Prescribing After  
21 Stroke. *Stroke* 2019; 50: 3592-3599. DOI: doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.026823.  
22  
23  
24 41. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *A snapshot of men's health in regional and*  
25 *remote Australia*. Australia Institute of Health and Welfare, 2010.  
26  
27  
28  
29 42. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Australia's Health 2012*. 2012. Australian  
30 Institute of Health and Welfare.  
31  
32  
33 43. Pateman KA, Cockburn NL, Batstone MD, et al. Quality of life of head and neck  
34 cancer patients in urban and regional areas: An Australian perspective. *Australian*  
35 *Journal of Rural Health* 2018; 26: 157-164.  
36  
37  
38  
39 44. Emery JD, Walter FM, Gray V, et al. Diagnosing cancer in the bush: a mixed-  
40 methods study of symptom appraisal and help-seeking behaviour in people with  
41 cancer from rural Western Australia. *Family practice* 2013; 30: 294-301.  
42  
43  
44  
45 45. Kilkenny Monique F, Lannin Natasha A, Anderson Craig S, et al. Quality of Life Is  
46 Poorer for Patients With Stroke Who Require an Interpreter. *Stroke* 2018; 49: 761-  
47 764. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.019771.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 46. Thayabaranathan T, Andrew NE, Kilkenny MF, et al. Factors influencing self-  
55 reported anxiety or depression following stroke or TIA using linked registry and  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 hospital data. *Quality of Life Research* 2018; 27: 3145-3155. DOI: 10.1007/s11136-  
4 018-1960-y.  
5  
6

7  
8 47. Kim H-Y. Statistical notes for clinical researchers: effect size. *Restor Dent Endod*  
9  
10 2015; 40: 328-331. 2015/10/02. DOI: 10.5395/rde.2015.40.4.328.  
11

12 48. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Admitted patient care 2017-18: Australian  
13 hospital statistics, [https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/hospitals/admitted-patient-care-](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/hospitals/admitted-patient-care-2017-18/contents/at-a-glance)  
14 [2017-18/contents/at-a-glance](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/hospitals/admitted-patient-care-2017-18/contents/at-a-glance) (2019).  
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

## Online Supplement 1 - Co-investigators and other contributors to the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry

The following people are acknowledged for their contribution to collecting hospital data on the patients registered in AuSCR or their participation on various governance committees between 2010 and 2015:

### Steering and Management Committee

**Craig Anderson** PhD (Royal Prince Alfred Hospital NSW, site investigator, The George Institute for Global Health University of New South Wales NSW, The George Institute for Global Health at Peking University Health Science Center China); **Dominique Cadilhac** PhD (Stroke and Ageing Research, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University VIC, Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC, Data Custodian); **Geoffrey Donnan** MD (Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC); **Rohan Grimley** MBBS (Gympie Hospital QLD, Nambour General Hospital QLD, site investigator, Sunshine Coast Clinical School, University of Queensland QLD); **Peter Hand** MBBS, MD, FRACP (Royal Melbourne Hospital VIC, site investigator)

### Steering Committee

**Julie Bernhardt** PhD (The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC); **Paul Bew** MPhy (The Prince Charles Hospital QLD); **Christopher Bladin** MD, MBBS, FRACP (Box Hill Hospital VIC, site investigator); **Greg Cadigan** BN (Queensland State-wide Stroke Clinical Network QLD); **Helen Castley** MBBS (Royal Hobart Hospital Tasmania, site investigator); **Andrew Evans** MBBS (Hons), FRACP (Westmead Hospital NSW); **Susan Hillier** PhD (University of South Australia, SA); **Erin Lalor** PhD (Stroke Foundation VIC); **Andrew Lee** MBBS FRACP (Flinders Medical Centre, South Australia); **Richard Lindley** PhD (The George Institute for Global Health NSW); **Mark Mackay** MBBS, FRACP (Royal Children's Hospital VIC, site investigator); **Sandra Martyn** (Health Statistics Centre Queensland Health QLD); **John McNeil** PhD (Monash University VIC); **Sandy Middleton** PhD (Nursing Research Institute, St Vincent's Health Australia NSW, Australian Catholic University NSW); **Michael Pollack** MBBS, FAFRM (RACP), FACRM, FFPM (ANZCA), MMedSci (Clin Epi) (Hunter Stroke Service NSW); **Mark Simcocks** BSc (VIC, Consumer Representative); **Frances Simmonds** MSc(Med), (Australasian Rehabilitation Outcomes Centre NSW); **Amanda Thrift** PhD (Stroke and Ageing Research, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University VIC); **Andrew Wesseldine** MBBS, FRACP (St John of God Healthcare; Department of Health WA)

### Management Committee

**Helen Dewey** PhD (Austin Hospital VIC, Box Hill Hospital VIC, site investigator, Eastern Health Clinical School, Monash University VIC); **Steven Faux** FAFRM (RACP) (St Vincent's Health Australia NSW); **Kelvin Hill** BAppSci (Stroke Foundation VIC); **Natasha Lannin** PhD (Faculty of Health Sciences, La Trobe University VIC, Occupational Therapy Department, Alfred Health VIC); **Christopher Levi** PhD (Acute Stroke Services, John Hunter Hospital NSW, site investigator); **Christopher Price** BSocW BSc (National Stroke Foundation)



## Site Investigators

**Lauren Arthurson** BSpPath, MHIthServMt (Echuca Regional Health VIC); **Pradeep Bambery** MD, FRCP(G), FRACP (Bundaberg Hospital QLD); **Tim Bates** MBBS, FRACP (Swan District Hospital WA); **Carolyn Beltrame** RN (Div1) (Latrobe Regional Hospital VIC); **David Blacker** MBBS, FRACP (Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital WA); **Ernie Butler** MBBS FRACP (Peninsula Health VIC); **Sean Butler** FIMLS, BM Hons, MRCP(UK), FRACP (Prince Charles Hospital QLD); **Chris Charnley** MBBS (Warrnambool Base Hospital VIC); **Jo Cotterell** BPhysio (Mildura Base Hospital VIC); **Douglas Crompton** MA, PhD, MBBS, FRACP (Northern Hospital VIC); **Vanessa Crosby** Dip Physio (Albury-Wodonga Health VIC); **Carolyn De Wytt** MRCP (UK), MB BCH DUBL, FRACP (Greenslopes Private Hospital QLD); **David Douglas** MBBS, M Admin, FRACGP, FAFRM (RACP) (Ipswich Hospital QLD); **Martin Dunlop** MBBS, FACRM (Cairns Base Hospital QLD); **Paula Easton** BPhy (Hons) (Mackay Hospital QLD); **Sharan Ermel** RN (Div1) (Bendigo Health VIC); **Nisal Gange** MBBS, AMC CERT (Toowoomba Hospital QLD); **Richard Geraghty** MBBS, FRACP (Redcliffe Hospital QLD); **Melissa Gill** BAppSc (SpPath) (Armidale Hospital, NSW); **Graham Hall** MBBS, FRACP (Princess Alexandra Hospital QLD); **Geoffrey Herkes** MBBS, PhD, FRACP (Royal North Shore Hospital NSW); **Karen Hines** BHIM (Caboolture Hospital QLD); **Francis Hishon** RN (Redland Hospital QLD); **James Hughes** BMed, FRACP (Tamworth Hospital NSW); **Joel Iedema** MBBS, FRACP (Redland Hospital QLD); **Martin Jude** MBBS, FRACP (Wagga Wagga Hospital NSW); **Thomas Kraemer** Approbation als Arzt, STATE EXAM MED MUNSTER, FRACP (Ballarat Health Services VIC); **Paul Laird** MBBS, FRACP (Rockhampton Hospital QLD); **Johanna Madden** BPhysio (Goulburn Valley Health VIC); **Graham Mahaffey** RN (Hervey Bay Hospital QLD); **Suzana Milosevic** MD, FRACP, AMC CERT (Logan Hospital QLD); **Peter O'Brien** MBBS, DIP RANZCOG, FRACMA, FACRRM (Warrnambool Hospital VIC); **Trisha Oxley** RN/RM, MANP (Critical Care) (Swan Hill District Health VIC); **Michaela Plante** RN (Div 1) (Rockhampton Hospital QLD); **Juan Rois-Gnecco** Medico Cirujano Javeriana, FAFRM (Ipswich Hospital QLD); **Stephen Read** MBBS, PhD, FRACP (Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital QLD); **Kristen Rowe** BNurs, Cert NeuroSci Nurs (Austin Health VIC); **Fiona Ryan** BAppSc (SpPath), MHIthSc (Orange Hospital and Bathurst Hospitals NSW); **Arman Sabet** MD, FRACP, BSc (Gold Coast Hospital and Robina Hospital QLD); **Noel Saines** MBBS, FRACP (The Wesley Hospital QLD); **Eva Salud** MD, AMC CERT (Gympie Hospital QLD); **Amanda Siller** MBBS, FRACP (Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital QLD); **Christopher Staples** MD (Mater Adults QLD); **Amanda Styles** RN (Div 1) (Armidale Hospital NSW); **Judith Walloscheck** MBA (Bendigo Health VIC); **Richard White** MD, FRCP, FRACP. (Townsville Hospital QLD); **Andrew Wong** MBBS, PhD (Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital QLD); **Lillian Wong** MBBS FRACP (Logan Hospital QLD)

## Staff at The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC

Robin Armstrong, Leonid Churilov, Alison Dias, Kelly Drennan, Adele Gibbs, Brenda Grabsch, Jen Holland, Monique Kilkenny, Joosup Kim, Charlotte Krenus, Francis Kung, Joyce Lim, Karen Moss, Kate Paice, Enna Salama, Sam Shehata, Sabrina Small, Renee Stojanovic, Steven Street, Emma Tod, Kasey Wallis, Julia Watt

## Staff at Monash University VIC

Nadine Andrew



**Online Supplement 2 – Queensland Specific Care Processes**

Care Process	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value
Mobilised during admission	2,876 (69.3)	1,950 (80.1)	<0.001
Swallow screen or assessment	4,952 (74.2)	3,676 (83.5)	<0.001
Aspirin within 48h, if ischaemic	3,393 (68.2)	2,843 (75.8)	<0.001
Discharged on antithrombotic medication, if ischaemic	3,823 (80.1)	2,694 (86.7)	<0.001

For peer review only

**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	7-8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	11
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	13
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11-14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	2

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## Regional Differences in the Care and Outcomes of Acute Stroke Patients in Australia: an Observational Study using Evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR)

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-040418.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Nov-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Dwyer, Mitchell; University of Tasmania Faculty of Health, Francis, Karen; University of Tasmania Faculty of Health Peterson, Gregory; University of Tasmania, School of Pharmacy Ford, Karen; Royal Hobart Hospital, Centre of Education and Research Nursing and Midwifery Gall, Seana; University of Tasmania Phan, Hoang ; University of Tasmania, Menzies Institute for Medical Research; Pham Ngoc Thach University of Medicine, Department of Public Health Management Castley, Helen; Royal Hobart Hospital Wong, Lillian; Princess Alexandra Hospital White, Richard; Townsville Hospital Ryan, Fiona; New South Wales Department of Health Arthurson, Lauren; Echuca Regional Health Kim, Joosup; Monash University, Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences Cadilhac, Dominique; Monash University, Medicine Lannin, Natasha; Monash University Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Sciences, Neuroscience
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Neurology
Keywords:	Stroke medicine < INTERNAL MEDICINE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

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

## Regional Differences in the Care and Outcomes of Acute Stroke Patients in Australia: an Observational Study using Evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR)

Mitchell Dwyer<sup>1</sup>, Karen Francis<sup>1</sup>, Gregory M. Peterson<sup>1</sup>, Karen M. Ford<sup>1,2</sup>, Seana Gall<sup>1</sup>, Hoang T. Phan<sup>1</sup>, Helen Castley<sup>2</sup>, Lillian Wong<sup>3</sup>, Richard White<sup>4</sup>, Fiona Ryan<sup>5</sup>, Lauren Arthurson<sup>6</sup>, Joosup Kim<sup>7,8</sup>, Dominique A. Cadilhac<sup>7,8\*</sup>, Natasha A. Lannin<sup>9,10\*</sup> on behalf of the AuSCR consortium.

\*equally contributed as senior authors

### Affiliations:

1. College of Health and Medicine, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
2. Royal Hobart Hospital, Tasmanian Health Service, Hobart, Australia
3. Princess Alexandra Hospital, Metro South Health, Brisbane, Australia
4. Townsville Hospital and Health Service, Townsville, Australia
5. Western New South Wales Local Health District, Australia
6. Echuca Regional Health, Echuca, Australia
7. Stroke and Ageing Research, Department of Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University, Clayton, Australia
8. Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Heidelberg, University of Melbourne, Australia
9. Alfred Health, Prahran, Australia
10. Department of Neuroscience, Central Clinical School, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

### ORCID IDs

Mitchell Dwyer	0000-0002-9956-2569
Karen Francis	0000-0003-3578-2498
Gregory M. Peterson	0000-0002-6764-3882
Karen M. Ford	0000-0003-2834-721X
Seana Gall	0000-0002-5138-2526
Hoang T. Phan	0000-0003-0506-2924
Helen Castley	N/A
Lillian Wong	0000-0003-1579-4109
Richard White	N/A
Fiona Ryan	N/A
Lauren Arthurson	N/A
Joosup Kim	0000-0002-4079-0428
Dominique A. Cadilhac	0000-0001-8162-682X
Natasha A. Lannin	0000-0002-2066-8345

**Word count:** 2,920

## Tables

Table 1. Patient characteristics by region

Table 2. Processes of care by region

Table 3. Survival analysis of stroke patients by region

Table 4. HRQoL at 90-180 day follow-up by region

**Key terms:** Stroke, care, healthcare disparities, health services accessibility, hospitalisation, urban health, rural health, outcome assessment (health care)

**Funding statement:** AuSCR was supported by grants from the NHMRC (1034415), Monash University<sup>†</sup>, Queensland Health<sup>†</sup>, Stroke Foundation<sup>†</sup>, Allergan<sup>†</sup>, Ipsen<sup>†</sup>, and Boehringer Ingelheim<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Award/grant numbers are not applicable

### Author for correspondence:

Professor Natasha A. Lannin

Department of Neuroscience, Central Clinical School, Monash University

Level 6 Alfred Centre, 99 Commercial Road, Melbourne, VIC 3004 Australia.

Phone: +61 (3) 99 030 795

E-mail: natasha.lannin@monash.edu

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To compare the processes and outcomes of care in patients with stroke treated in urban versus rural hospitals in Australia.

**Design:** Observational study using data from a multicentre national registry.

**Setting:** Data from 50 acute care hospitals in Australia (25 urban, 25 rural) which participated in the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry during the period 2010 to 2015.

**Participants:** Patients were divided into two groups (urban, rural) according to the Australian Standard Geographical Classification Remoteness Area classification. Data pertaining to 28,115 stroke patients were analysed, of whom 8,159 (29%) were admitted to hospitals located within rural areas.

**Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures:** Regional differences in processes of care (admission to a stroke unit, thrombolysis for ischaemic stroke, discharge on anti-hypertensive medication, and the provision of a care plan). Survival analyses up to 180 days and health-related quality of life at 90-180 days.

**Results:** Compared to those admitted to urban hospitals, patients in rural hospitals less often received thrombolysis (urban 12.7% vs rural 7.5%,  $p<0.001$ ) or received treatment in stroke units (urban 82.2% vs 76.5%,  $p<0.001$ ), and fewer were discharged with a care plan (urban 61.3% vs 44.7%,  $p<0.001$ ). No significant differences were found in terms of survival or overall self-reported quality of life.

**Conclusions:** Rural access to recommended components of acute stroke care was comparatively poorer; however, this did not appear to impact health outcomes at approximately 6 months.



## Article Summary

### *Strengths and Limitations of this Study*

- This is the first study in Australia to look at how access to acute stroke care varies between Australia's urban and rural areas, using data from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR).
- This study also reports on regional differences in patient outcomes, in the form of mortality and health-related quality of life (HRQoL) at up to 180 days post-stroke.
- Patient outcome measures were adjusted for known confounders.
- Hospitals participating in the AuSCR may not be representative of all Australian hospitals.

## Introduction

Internationally, evidence suggests that patients with stroke admitted to hospitals located in rural or regional areas have limited access to known evidence-based interventions, such as thrombolysis and stroke unit care, relative to those treated in urban hospitals.<sup>1</sup> There is a paucity of research investigating disparities in other, more elementary processes which define contemporary standards of acute stroke care, such as the prescription of secondary prevention medications. In addition, if there are differences in stroke care between urban and rural regions, determining if there are corresponding differences in patient outcomes warrants attention so as to permit future exploration of organisational, process or patient barriers preventing evidence-based stroke care being received.

Overall, prior research on the rural and urban outcomes of care has yielded inconsistent findings,<sup>1</sup> and is characterised by studies with inadequate risk adjustment,<sup>2-4</sup> or an indirect focus on urban-rural differences in outcomes.<sup>5-7</sup> Previous attempts to explore this issue have also been reliant on ‘hard’ outcome measures such as rates of mortality and readmission;<sup>8-10</sup> whereas regional differences in patients’ quality of life has been rarely investigated.<sup>11,12</sup> Given this knowledge gap, the aim of this study was to compare the processes of care and outcomes for patients with stroke treated in urban compared with rural hospitals.

## Methods

### *Study design*

We undertook a multicentre observational cohort study of adults admitted to hospital with acute stroke using linked data from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR) (see protocol<sup>13</sup> and [www.auscr.com.au](http://www.auscr.com.au)). The AuSCR is used to monitor processes of care provided to, and the outcomes of, individuals hospitalised with acute stroke or transient ischaemic

1  
2  
3 attacks (TIAs) in Australian hospitals primary for quality improvement and benchmarking  
4 activities.<sup>13</sup> Cases are entered prospectively in the AuSCR based on clinical diagnosis of  
5 stroke during the admission. Case ascertainment is checked annually using International  
6 Classification of Diseases (ICD)-10 discharge codes obtained from the hospital  
7 administrative system and compared to the cases entered in the registry at each hospital. A  
8 complete list of co-investigators and other contributors to the AuSCR is contained in online  
9 supplement 1. Death information (date and cause) from Australia's National Death Index  
10 (NDI) are routinely linked to the AuSCR by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare  
11 (AIHW).<sup>14</sup> For this study, we used data from all 50 hospitals who submitted data to the  
12 AuSCR from January 2010 to December 2015. Patients diagnosed with TIAs were excluded  
13 from the analyses, as these individuals are unlikely to require the care processes of interest in  
14 this study. As at 2015, the 50 hospitals covered by the AuSCR accounted for approximately  
15 46% of all Australian hospitals receiving  $n \geq 50$  stroke admissions per annum.<sup>15</sup> Selection bias  
16 is minimised in the AuSCR by use of an "opt-out" approach when recruiting participants,  
17 whereby all eligible patients are registered unless they or their next of kin nominates to have  
18 their data excluded.<sup>13</sup> The proportion of cases who opt-out from the registry is <3% in urban  
19 and rural hospitals. Patients who did not opt out of the registry, and who were discharged  
20 from hospital following their stroke, were followed up by trained research staff between 90  
21 and 180 days following their index admission (i.e. the first registered event in AuSCR). This  
22 process uses a modified Dillman protocol,<sup>16</sup> whereby two attempts are made to contact  
23 patients by post prior to an attempt by telephone.<sup>17</sup>

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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Process of care data collected in AuSCR up to 2015 were: admission to a stroke unit, thrombolysis (ischaemic stroke only), discharge on anti-hypertensive medication, and the provision of a care plan. Care plans are developed with the patient and family if discharged from acute care directly to the community (i.e., to a home setting or institutional residential

1  
2  
3 aged care and not transferred to another hospital, that is, for rehabilitation). This is not the  
4  
5 discharge summary written by hospital clinicians for the primary care doctor; the discharge  
6  
7 care plan should include information to improve the transition to home, such as arrangements  
8  
9 for community support services, information on risk factor management, equipment to be  
10  
11 purchased, and follow-up appointments. Hospitals located in the state of Queensland also  
12  
13 collected four additional variables: time to first mobilisation, dysphagia screen, aspirin within  
14  
15 48 hours, and being discharged on antiplatelets or antithrombotics if an ischemic event.  
16  
17 Indicator data with responses of no, unknown, or missing were recoded as negative  
18  
19 (proportion of missing data ranged from <1% to 5.05%). Regional differences in patient  
20  
21 mortality were assessed using intervals of 7, 30, 90 and 180 days.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Participants' health-related quality of life (HRQoL) data were collected at 90-180 day follow-  
30  
31 up using the EuroQoL-5 dimension-3 level (EQ-5D-3L) instrument.<sup>18</sup> Respondents were  
32  
33 asked to report their health status in five domains (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain or  
34  
35 discomfort, and anxiety or depression) with each domain having three possible responses (no  
36  
37 problems, some problems, and extreme problems). Respondents use a Visual Analogue Scale  
38  
39 (VAS) to rate their overall perceived health from 0 to 100, with 0 being the worst imaginable  
40  
41 health state and 100 the best imaginable health state.<sup>18</sup> The VAS was coded as 0 for  
42  
43 individuals who had died within the follow-up period.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 ***Statistical analysis***

51  
52 The primary exposure variable of interest was classification of hospital (urban versus rural),  
53  
54 and the primary outcomes were survival analyses up to 180 days was health related quality of  
55  
56 life as assessed on the EQ-5D-3L. Hospitals were divided into categories of 'urban' or 'rural'  
57  
58 based on their classification under the Australian Standard Geographical Classification  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Remoteness Area (ASGC-RA) system.<sup>19</sup> The ASGC-RA system classifies areas into five  
4 categories: major cities, inner regional, outer regional, remote or very remote.<sup>19</sup> For the  
5 purpose of this study, hospitals located in ASGC-RA category 1 (i.e. major cities) were  
6 regarded as 'urban', while those in categories 2 or above were regarded as 'rural'. Interactive  
7 maps with overlays of the RA categories can be accessed via the Australian Bureau of  
8 Statistics website.<sup>20</sup> The majority of hospitals (>95%) that contribute data to AuSCR are  
9 funded under the public health care scheme. Participants' baseline characteristics were  
10 compared between regions using  $\chi^2$  tests for categorical data, and Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests  
11 for continuous variables. Care processes were expressed as the proportion of eligible patients  
12 who received each form of care and were analysed by location (urban or rural) using  $\chi^2$  tests.  
13  
14 Participants' responses to the EQ-5D-3L instrument were expressed as the number of  
15 individuals who encountered problems with each domain, with 'some problems' and  
16 'extreme problems' being recoded into one category. Regional differences within each  
17 domain were then analysed using  $\chi^2$  tests.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 Cox proportional hazards regression analysis was conducted to assess deaths within 7, 30, 90,  
39 and 180 days. Logistic regression was used to assess regional differences in each of the EQ-  
40 5D-3L domains. Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke,  
41 ability to walk on admission (as a validated measure of stroke severity)<sup>21</sup> and socioeconomic  
42 status (SES) using the index of relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage  
43 (IRSAD).<sup>22</sup> Each regression model also accounted for inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital  
44 stroke, and whether the individual received treatment in a stroke unit. Patient clustering was  
45 adjusted for directly in each of our models, to account for correlation between patients  
46 admitted to the same hospital. A sensitivity analysis was undertaken using datasets where  
47 inter-hospital transfers were excluded, to assess the potential impact of this variable on  
48 patient outcomes. Data were analysed using Stata/SE 12.<sup>23</sup>

### ***Patient and Public Involvement***

patients and/or the public were not directly involved in the design, recruitment or implementation of the study. Consumer representatives are members of the AuSCR Steering Committee, and regular reviews by consumers of the AuSCR documents (policies and reports) are undertaken.

### ***Ethical approval***

All participating hospitals have provided ethical and governance approvals for AuSCR data collection and analysis. Ethical approval was obtained from the AIHW to conduct data linkage to the NDI, and from the Tasmanian Human Research Ethics Committee to conduct this data analysis (reference H0017787).

### **Results**

Between 2010 and 2015, 28,115 episodes of care from 50 hospitals were registered in the AuSCR. Of these episodes, 8,159 (29%) were for individuals admitted to hospitals located within rural areas. Compared to those from urban areas, individuals from rural areas were more likely to have been born in Australia, have an indigenous background, and be of a lower SES (Table 1). Rural patients were also more likely than urban patients to be diagnosed with a stroke of 'undetermined' subtype (8.1% vs 3.6%). When compared to urban patients, those treated in rural hospitals had poorer access to several clinical processes of care (Table 2, online supplement 2 for variables collected only in Queensland). Specifically, rural patients were less likely to be admitted to a stroke unit (odds ratio [OR] = 0.70, 95% Confidence Interval [CI] 0.66 to 0.74), receive intravenous thrombolysis in ischaemic stroke (OR = 0.55, 95% CI 0.50 to 0.62), or be provided with a care plan at time of discharge (OR = 0.59, 95% CI 0.54 to 0.64). There were no significant differences between regions in prescribing rates of anti-hypertensive medications at discharge (OR = 0.97, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.03). Regional

differences in the proportion of patients discharged home were not observed, but urban patients were more likely to die in hospital in the unadjusted comparisons (Table 2). The median LOS for rural patients was one day shorter than that of urban patients, and this remained the case after adjustment for potential confounders (coefficient -1, 95% CI -1.97 to -.03).

**Table 1. Patient characteristics by region**

Characteristics	Urban n (%)	Rural n (%)	p-value
No. of sites	25 (50)	25 (50)	
No. of cases	19,956 (71)	8,159 (29)	
Female	9,095 (45.6)	3,770 (46.2)	0.335
<b>Age (years)</b>			
<65	4,910 (24.6)	2,095 (25.7)	0.030
65-74	4,468 (22.4)	1,887 (23.1)	
75-84	6,141 (30.8)	2,469 (30.3)	
85+	4,431 (22.2)	1,707 (20.9)	
Median age in years (Q1, Q3) <sup>a</sup>	76.1 (65.2, 84.2)	75.4 (64.7, 83.6)	0.003
<b>State</b>			
New South Wales	3,252 (16.3)	805 (9.9)	<0.001
Queensland	6,675 (33.4)	4,401 (53.9)	
Tasmania	-	1,118 (13.7)	
Victoria	9,133 (45.8)	1,835 (22.5)	
Western Australia	896 (4.5)	-	
Born in Australia	11,916 (59.7)	6,282 (77)	<0.001
Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander	174 (0.9)	262 (3.2)	<0.001
<b>Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage</b>			
Quintile 1 (most disadvantaged)	2,367 (12.3)	2,557 (34.4)	<0.001
Quintile 2	2,764 (14.3)	1,932 (26)	
Quintile 3	3,335 (17.3)	1,603 (21.6)	
Quintile 4	4,837 (25.1)	1,092 (14.7)	
Quintile 5 (most advantaged)	5,986 (31)	244 (3.3)	
Able to walk on admission (stroke severity)	6,055 (32.7)	2,439 (34.6)	0.003
<b>Stroke subtype</b>			
Intracerebral haemorrhagic	3,247 (16.3)	1,177 (14.4)	<0.001
Ischaemic	15,962 (80.1)	6,313 (77.5)	
Undetermined	709 (3.6)	658 (8.1)	
Transfer from other hospitals	2,191 (11.2)	1,739 (21.6)	<0.001
In-hospital stroke	1,156 (5.9)	407 (5.1)	0.008
Length of stay, median (Q1, Q3) <sup>a</sup> days	6 (3-10)	5 (2-8)	<0.001
Died in hospital <sup>b</sup>	2,216 (11.3)	720 (9.5)	<0.001
<b>Discharge destination</b>			
Home	7,353 (41.4)	2,899 (39)	0.092
Rehabilitation	6,234 (35.1)	2,137 (28.7)	<0.001

Aged care	1,057 (6)	326 (4.4)	<0.001
Other	3,096 (17.5)	2,077 (27.9)	<0.001
<b>EQ-5D-dimensions</b>			
<b>Mobility</b>			
No problems	4,171 (47.1)	1,791 (48.4)	
Some problems	4,056 (45.8)	1,714 (46.4)	
Extreme problems	631 (7.1)	193 (5.2)	<0.001
<b>Self-care</b>			
No problems	5,784 (65.2)	2,499 (67.4)	
Some problems	2,012 (22.7)	872 (23.5)	
Extreme problems	1,069 (12.1)	339 (9.1)	<0.001
<b>Usual activities</b>			
No problems	3,445 (38.9)	1,448 (39.1)	
Some problems	3,590 (40.6)	1,571 (42.3)	
Extreme problems	1,809 (20.5)	688 (18.6)	0.034
<b>Pain/discomfort</b>			
No problems	4,401 (50)	1,876 (50.9)	
Some problems	3,955 (44.9)	1,622 (44)	
Extreme problems	446 (5.1)	190 (5.1)	0.621
<b>Anxiety/depression</b>			
No problems	4,632 (52.8)	1,948 (52.9)	
Some problems	3,630 (41.3)	1,527 (41.5)	
Extreme problems	518 (5.9)	208 (5.6)	0.860

<sup>a</sup>Q1: 25th percentile; Q3: 75th percentile

<sup>b</sup><5% missing/not documented data.

**Table 2. Processes of care by region**

	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value
<b>Evidence-based therapies (all states)</b>			
Treated in a stroke unit	16,408 (82.2)	6,241 (76.5)	<0.001
Intravenous thrombolysis for ischaemic stroke	2,007 (12.7)	463 (7.5)	<0.001
Discharged on antihypertensives	12,184 (70.6)	4,895 (69.9)	0.315
Care plan on discharge to community	4,871 (61.3)	1,441 (44.7)	<0.001

There were no significant differences between geographical groups in terms of survival up to 180 days (Table 3). In relation to HRQoL, no regional differences were observed in four of the EQ-5D domains, namely Anxiety/Depression, Mobility, Self-care, and Usual Activities (Table 4). Rural patients were, however, significantly less likely to have reported symptoms of pain or discomfort during the follow up period (OR = 0.88, 95% CI 0.79 to 0.97,  $p = 0.015$ ). Rural patients also had marginally higher perceived health, as measured by VAS, than



their urban counterparts (70 vs 68,  $p < 0.001$ ). The sensitivity analysis that excluded transferred patients did not influence the results.

**Table 3. Survival analysis of rural stroke patients as compared to urban stroke patients**

Time to death	Urban	Rural	p-value	Model*	
	n (%)	n (%)		HR	95% CI
Up to 7 days	1,750 (8.8)	769 (9.4)	0.081	0.98	(0.79-1.21)
8 to 30 days	1,242 (6.2)	491 (6)	0.608	1.02	(0.87-1.20)
31 to 90 days	745 (3.7)	265 (3.2)	0.055	0.88	(0.73-1.06)
91 to 180 days	526 (2.6)	202 (2.5)	0.439	0.88	(0.69-1.11)

\*Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke, ability to walk on admission, socioeconomic status, inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital stroke, and stroke unit admission

**Table 4. Outcomes at 90-180 day follow-up of rural patients as compared to urban patients**

EQ-5D-dimensions	Urban n (%)	Rural n (%)	p-value	Model		
				OR	95% CI	p-value
Mobility	4,687 (52.9)	1,907 (51.6)	0.169	1.02	(0.92-1.13)	0.717
Self-care	3,081 (34.8)	1,211 (32.6)	0.023	0.92	(0.80-1.06)	0.235
Usual activities	5,399 (61)	2,259 (60.9)	0.910	0.95	(0.85-1.06)	0.376
Pain/discomfort	4,401 (50)	1,812 (49.1)	0.376	0.88	(0.79-0.97)	0.015
Anxiety/depression	4,148 (47.2)	1,735 (47.1)	0.890	0.98	(0.87-1.10)	0.759
<b>Median VAS (Q1, Q3)</b>	<b>68 (40, 80)</b>	<b>70 (50, 83)</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	-	-	-

\*Models were adjusted for age, sex, year of admission, state, type of stroke, ability to walk on admission, socioeconomic status, inter-hospital transfers, in-hospital stroke, and stroke unit admission

## Discussion

The primary aim of this study was to assess whether there are differences in the quality of care and outcomes for patients treated in urban and rural locations. We found that patients

1  
2  
3 admitted to rural hospitals in Australia were less likely to receive some key care processes  
4 that are recommended in our national stroke clinical guidelines.<sup>24</sup> However, for the most part,  
5 we did not observe corresponding differences in patient 90-180 day outcomes.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Patients admitted to rural hospitals were significantly less likely to receive treatment in a  
13 stroke unit (76.5% vs 82.2%) despite only one rural hospital not being equipped with a stroke  
14 unit (n=30 episodes of care). This finding suggests that while nearly all rural sites had  
15 facilities which met the minimum criteria for stroke units,<sup>25</sup> many were unable to utilise their  
16 stroke unit's full potential. As observed by Dwyer et al.,<sup>26</sup> hospitals without 'quarantined'  
17 stroke unit beds may be unable to offer specialist care to stroke patients at times when there is  
18 demand for beds from other medical specialties. Such hospitals may benefit from using  
19 clinical coordinators to facilitate organisational change, as recommended by Cadilhac and  
20 colleagues.<sup>27</sup>  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 It should be noted that during the study period only 45% of patients located in Australia's  
36 'regional' areas received treatment in a stroke unit, and only 3.3% of all stroke unit beds were  
37 located in regional areas.<sup>28,29</sup> Taken together, these statistics indicate that access to stroke  
38 units within rural hospitals participating in the AuSCR was markedly better than the national  
39 average. Given that there is a well-established link between stroke unit admission and access  
40 to key aspects of acute stroke care,<sup>30</sup> future efforts should focus on increasing the number of  
41 stroke units within Australia's regional areas, and improving access to existing stroke units.  
42  
43 Adherence rates in the current study were, for the most part, representative of that of more  
44 recent stroke care audits in Australia.<sup>31,32</sup> The main exception was in rates of care plan  
45 provision; on average 53% of patients in the current study received this form of care, which  
46 was substantially lower than that of AuSCR data from 2018 (69%)<sup>32</sup> and data from the Stroke  
47 Foundation's 2019 Acute Audit (65%).<sup>31</sup>  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Consistent with other studies, rural patients remained less likely than urban patients to be  
7 administered thrombolysis. The provision of thrombolysis is known to be influenced by a  
8 host of patient, clinician and system-related factors.<sup>33</sup> Of these factors, patients' distance to  
9 hospitals, accessing brain imaging after-hours, and obtaining specialist input are among the  
10 most pertinent issues encountered by clinicians providing thrombolysis in rural areas.<sup>34-36</sup>  
11  
12 Rural-based clinicians in the Australian state of Victoria have been able to obtain specialist  
13 input and improve thrombolysis rates through the use of a telemedicine program.<sup>37</sup> Such a  
14 system was implemented in the state of Victoria for a small part of the study period,<sup>37</sup> and as  
15 such, may have influenced adherence rates in this group of hospitals. The use of telemedicine  
16 technology in all regional areas of the country is urgently needed in order to increase rates of  
17 thrombolysis administration.<sup>38</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 We did not observe differences by location in rates of prescription for antihypertensive  
34 medications at hospital discharge. As has been noted previously,<sup>39</sup> this may reflect the fact  
35 that the management of patients' blood pressure for primary or secondary prevention is not  
36 necessarily specific to stroke, and does not require any additional resources. In any case, the  
37 rates of prescription for antihypertensive medications at discharge from both regions were  
38 substantially less than expected based on previous AuSCR data, indicating that more work  
39 needs to be done to improve this aspect of evidence-based care.<sup>40</sup>  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Despite marked differences in access to stroke unit care and thrombolysis, we did not observe  
52 any regional differences in rates of survival at up to 180 days post-stroke. This may be  
53 because access to acute stroke care, when considered in its entirety, was reasonably  
54 comparable between the study's urban and rural hospitals. This notion is supported by the  
55 fact that the study's rural hospitals, by virtue of their participation in the registry, are likely to  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 be highly motivated to monitor and improve their provision of stroke care, and perhaps are  
4  
5 better resourced than other rural sites. Furthermore, there is evidence that within the state of  
6  
7 Queensland (online supplement 2) patients in rural hospitals were provided evidence-based  
8  
9 therapies more often than those in urban hospitals. These differences warrant further research.  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 In relation to HRQoL, we observed that with the exception of the pain/discomfort domain,  
15  
16 there were no significant regional differences in any of the EQ-5D domains or VAS scores.  
17  
18 These findings stand in contrast to multiple surveys conducted by the Australian government,  
19  
20 in which rural residents had an overall lower self-reported health status.<sup>41,42</sup> The disparity  
21  
22 between regions in terms of self-reported pain/discomfort may point towards regional  
23  
24 differences in attitudes towards pain management. Indeed, literature on cancer patients in  
25  
26 Australia has highlighted that a culture of stoicism and self-reliance within rural areas can  
27  
28 make individuals less likely to report symptoms of pain<sup>43</sup> and delay seeking medical  
29  
30 assistance.<sup>44</sup> There are other demographic factors which may partially explain this finding.  
31  
32 For instance, previous researchers using the AuSCR data have found that patients with stroke  
33  
34 requiring an interpreter are more likely to report symptoms of pain.<sup>45</sup> Given that urban  
35  
36 patients in this study were far less likely to have been born in Australia (i.e. 59.7% vs 77%),  
37  
38 the impact of the respondents' English-speaking ability on our findings cannot be discounted.  
39  
40 Previous research using the AuSCR data has also highlighted that, other factors remaining  
41  
42 equal, younger people from a lower SES are more likely to report symptoms of  
43  
44 anxiety/depression.<sup>46</sup> We also found that rural patients had a significantly higher perceived  
45  
46 health status than urban patients (70 vs 68 via VAS); however, it is unlikely that this  
47  
48 difference represents a clinically relevant finding.<sup>47</sup>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 Our study design and data have several limitations. Firstly, we report data only up to 2015.  
59  
60 As with clinical quality registries internationally<sup>48</sup>, there is a delay in creating aggregate

1  
2  
3 national samples from local sites due to data sharing, ethics and cleaning delays. Ongoing  
4 reporting of the AuSCR data to continue to monitor quality of care and outcomes for patients  
5 treated in urban and rural locations will ensure continued monitoring of this issue. Specific to  
6 this comparison, we acknowledge that the distribution of urban and rural patients in this study  
7 (71% vs 29%) may not reflect that of the broader Australian hospital population, which  
8 recently stood at 64% and 36%, respectively.<sup>49</sup> We also did not use any data in relation to  
9 participants' residential addresses. It is therefore possible that some individuals who were  
10 admitted to urban hospitals resided in rural areas, and vice versa. A further limitation is that  
11 our HRQoL data did not factor in patients' health prior to their stroke, meaning it is possible  
12 that some individuals' HRQoL deficits may relate to pre-existing conditions. Lastly, although  
13 we used patients' baseline walking ability as a validated measure of stroke severity,<sup>21</sup> the  
14 study may have benefited from the use of a more recognised scale, such as the NIHSS.  
15 Despite these limitations, our study is the first of its kind in Australia to comprehensively  
16 examine urban-rural differences in access to acute stroke care and the associated patient  
17 outcomes. To the best of the authors' knowledge, it is also among the first in the world to  
18 report on urban-rural differences in patients' quality of life post-stroke.

## 41 **Conclusions**

42  
43  
44 This is the largest study to date examining geographic disparities in processes of stroke care,  
45 and providing a benchmark for the development and testing of interventions that may have  
46 the potential to reduce the differences between rural and urban patients with acute stroke.  
47 Interestingly, while we identified disparities in processes of care, we did not observe any  
48 association between geographic region and patient outcomes in terms of mortality or HRQoL.  
49 There are clear opportunities to better understand why the impact of these process of care  
50 variables on stroke outcomes are more pronounced in urban areas. Our findings underscore  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the importance of understanding how geographical area influences HRQoL and, in turn, how  
4 population disparities (such as life expectancy, income, and indigenous status) across  
5 geographical areas may contribute to these differences; continued efforts to determine the  
6 impact of stroke care post-discharge are important. Future work in this field should also focus  
7 on redressing the resourcing disparities, in particular increasing the number of rural hospitals  
8 which meet the minimum criteria for stroke unit care.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 **Declaration of competing interests**

22  
23 DAC is the data custodian for the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry and is supported by a  
24 National Health and Medical Research Council fellowship (1154273). She has received  
25 grants paid to her institution from Stroke Foundation, Melbourne Health, Victorian  
26 government, Queensland government, Tasmanian government, South Australian government,  
27 Western Australian government, Boehringer Ingelheim, Medtronic, Pfizer, Amgen and Shire.  
28  
29 NAL is the Chair of the Management Committee of the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry,  
30 and a member of the Stroke Foundation Clinical Council. NAL is supported by National  
31 Heart Foundation of Australia (GNT102055).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Contributorship statement**

46  
47 HC, MD, GP, SG, KMF, KF and DC contributed to the study design and concept. JK and DC  
48 contributed towards the statistical analyses. HTP, HC, LW, RW, FR, and LA participated in  
49 the manuscript preparation, editing and revision and agreed upon the final version of the  
50 paper. NL contributed to the interpretation of results and was heavily involved in the final  
51 preparation of the paper.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Data sharing statement:** contact can be made with the corresponding author for queries  
4  
5 relating to unpublished data.  
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

For peer review only

## References

1. Dwyer M, Rehman S, Ottavi T, et al. Urban-rural differences in the care and outcomes of acute stroke patients: systematic review. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2018; 397: 63-74.
2. Fleet R, Bussi eres S, Tounkara FK, et al. Rural versus urban academic hospital mortality following stroke in Canada. *PloS One* 2018; 13: e0191151.
3. Harnod D, Choi W-M, Chang R-E, et al. Are major medical centers better for stroke and myocardial infarction patients in Taiwan? A nationwide population-based study. *International Journal of Gerontology* 2010; 4: 137-142.
4. Lichtman JH, Leifheit-Limson EC, Jones SB, et al. 30-day risk-standardized mortality and readmission rates after ischemic stroke in critical access hospitals. *Stroke* 2012; 43: 2741-2747.
5. Borhani-Haghighi A, Safari R, Heydari ST, et al. Hospital mortality associated with stroke in southern Iran. *Iranian Journal of Medical Sciences* 2013; 38: 314.
6. Hemphill JC, 3rd, Newman J, Zhao S, et al. Hospital usage of early do-not-resuscitate orders and outcome after intracerebral hemorrhage. *Stroke* 2004; 35: 1130-1134. DOI: 10.1161/01.STR.0000125858.71051.ca.
7. Ido MS, Bayakly R, Frankel M, et al. Administrative data linkage to evaluate a quality improvement program in acute stroke care, Georgia, 2006-2009. *Preventing Chronic Disease* 2015; 12: E05. DOI: 10.5888/pcd12.140238.
8. Kilkenny MF, Dewey HM, Sundararajan V, et al. Readmissions after stroke: linked data from the Australian stroke clinical registry and hospital databases. *Med J Aust* 2015; 203: 102-106.
9. Saposnik G, Baibergenova A, O'Donnell M, et al. Hospital volume and stroke outcome Does it matter? *Neurology* 2007; 69: 1142-1151.



10. Thompson MP, Zhao X, Bekelis K, et al. Regional variation in 30-day ischemic stroke outcomes for medicare beneficiaries treated in Get With The Guidelines–Stroke hospitals. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* 2017; 10. DOI: 10.1161/circoutcomes.117.003604.
11. Santos NMF, Tavares DMS and Dias FA. Quality of life comparasion of elderly urban and rural stroke victims. *Revista de Pesquisa: Cuidado é Fundamental Online* 2014; 6: 387-397.
12. Nuttaset Manimmanakorn M, Vichiansiri R, Nuntharuksa C, et al. Quality of life after stroke rehabilitation among urban vs. rural patients in Thailand. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2008; 9: 394-399.
13. Cadilhac DA, Lannin NA, Anderson CS, et al. Protocol and pilot data for establishing the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry. *International Journal of Stroke* 2010; 5: 217-226.
14. Cadilhac DA, Kilkenny MF, Levi CR, et al. Risk-adjusted hospital mortality rates for stroke: evidence from the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR). *Med J Aust* 2017; 206: 345-350.
15. National Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit: Acute Services Report 2015, <https://informme.org.au/en/stroke-data/Acute-audits> (2015).
16. Dillman DA. The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual review of sociology* 1991; 17: 225-249.
17. Lannin NA, Anderson C, Lim J, et al. Telephone follow-up was more expensive but more efficient than postal in a national stroke registry. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2013; 66: 896-902.
18. Group TE. EuroQol-a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health policy* 1990; 16: 199-208.

- 1  
2  
3 19. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Standard Geographical Classification  
4 (ASGC),  
5  
6  
7  
8 <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/8B8ABC8EC6>  
9  
10 [2D8F46CA2570AE00DD3B5?opendocument](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/allprimarymainfeatures/8B8ABC8EC6) (2011).  
11
- 12 20. Statistics ABo. ABS Maps, <https://itt.abs.gov.au/itt/r.jsp?ABSMaps> (2020).  
13
- 14 21. Counsell C, Dennis M, McDowall M, et al. Predicting outcome after acute and  
15 subacute stroke. *Stroke* 2002; 33: 1041-1047.  
16
- 17 22. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA),  
18  
19 <https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2033.0.55.001Main+Features>  
20  
21 [12016?OpenDocument](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2033.0.55.001Main+Features) (2018).  
22  
23
- 24 23. StataCorp L. Stata data analysis and statistical Software. *Special Edition Release*  
25  
26 2007; 10: 733.  
27
- 28 24. Stroke Foundation. Clinical Guidelines for Stroke Management,  
29  
30 <https://informme.org.au/en/Guidelines/Clinical-Guidelines-for-Stroke-Management>  
31  
32 (2020).  
33
- 34 25. Stroke Foundation. Acute Stroke Services Framework,  
35  
36 <https://strokefoundation.org.au/->  
37  
38 [/media/E6682A70FFF0489FA66D28042C0FF472.ashx?la=en](https://strokefoundation.org.au/-) (2019).  
39  
40  
41
- 42 26. Dwyer M. Health care providers' perceptions of factors that influence the provision of  
43 acute stroke care in urban and rural settings: a qualitative study [thesis chapter].  
44  
45 *Regional Differences in Acute Stroke Care and Patient Outcomes*. Hobart, Australia:  
46 University of Tasmania, 2020.  
47
- 48 27. Cadilhac DA, Purvis T, Kilkenny MF, et al. Evaluation of Rural Stroke Services Does  
49  
50 Implementation of Coordinators and Pathways Improve Care in Rural Hospitals?  
51  
52 *Stroke* 2013; 44: 2848-2853.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 28. Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit Acute Services Report (2017),  
4  
5 <https://informme.org.au/en/stroke-data/Acute-audits>.  
6  
7
- 8 29. National Stroke Foundation. Clinical Audit: Organisational Survey Report 2013,  
9  
10 <https://informme.org.au/->  
11  
12 [/media/E427FAC31B934527BDA5F35CC7DEB699.ashx?la=en](https://informme.org.au/-/media/E427FAC31B934527BDA5F35CC7DEB699.ashx?la=en) (2013).  
13  
14
- 15 30. Stroke Unit Trialists Collaboration. Organised inpatient (stroke unit) care for stroke.  
16  
17 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013; 11. DOI:  
18  
19 10.1002/14651858.CD000197.pub3.  
20  
21
- 22 31. Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit: Acute Services Report 2019,  
23  
24 <https://informme.org.au/->  
25  
26 [/media/0DAA2643E8F7424C84D384EB16CF0716.ashx?la=en](https://informme.org.au/-/media/0DAA2643E8F7424C84D384EB16CF0716.ashx?la=en) (2019).  
27  
28
- 29 32. Australian Stroke Clinical Registry (AuSCR). Annual Report,  
30  
31 <https://auscr2.files.wordpress.com/2020/03/auscr-2018-annual-report-final.pdf> (2018).  
32  
33
- 34 33. Baatiema L, Otim ME, Mnatzaganian G, et al. Health professionals' views on the  
35  
36 barriers and enablers to evidence-based practice for acute stroke care: a systematic  
37  
38 review. *Implementation Science* 2017; 12: 74.  
39
- 40 34. Kapral M, Hall R, Gozdyra P, et al. Geographic access to stroke care services in rural  
41  
42 communities in Ontario, Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Neurological Sciences*  
43  
44 2020; 47: 301-308.  
45  
46
- 47 35. Moloczij N, Mosley I, Moss K, et al. Is telemedicine helping or hindering the delivery  
48  
49 of stroke thrombolysis in rural areas? A qualitative analysis. *Internal Medicine*  
50  
51 *Journal* 2015; 45: 957-964.  
52  
53
- 54 36. Joubert J, Prentice LF, Moulin T, et al. Stroke in rural areas and small communities.  
55  
56 *Stroke* 2008; 39: 1920-1928.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 37. Bladin CF, Kim J, Bagot KL, et al. Improving acute stroke care in regional hospitals:  
4 clinical evaluation of the Victorian Stroke Telemedicine program. *Medical Journal of*  
5 *Australia* 2020; 212: 371-377. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50570.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 38. Lindley RI. Telemedicine is improving outcomes for patients with stroke. *The*  
11 *Medical journal of Australia* 2020; 212: 364-365. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50587.  
12  
13  
14 39. Koifman J, Hall R, Li S, et al. The association between rural residence and stroke care  
15 and outcomes. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences* 2016; 363: 16-20. DOI:  
16 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2016.02.019>.  
17  
18  
19  
20 40. Dalli LL, Kim J, Thrift AG, et al. Disparities in Antihypertensive Prescribing After  
21 Stroke. *Stroke* 2019; 50: 3592-3599. DOI: doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.026823.  
22  
23  
24 41. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *A snapshot of men's health in regional and*  
25 *remote Australia*. Australia Institute of Health and Welfare, 2010.  
26  
27  
28  
29 42. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *Australia's Health 2012*. 2012. Australian  
30 Institute of Health and Welfare.  
31  
32  
33 43. Pateman KA, Cockburn NL, Batstone MD, et al. Quality of life of head and neck  
34 cancer patients in urban and regional areas: An Australian perspective. *Australian*  
35 *Journal of Rural Health* 2018; 26: 157-164.  
36  
37  
38  
39 44. Emery JD, Walter FM, Gray V, et al. Diagnosing cancer in the bush: a mixed-  
40 methods study of symptom appraisal and help-seeking behaviour in people with  
41 cancer from rural Western Australia. *Family practice* 2013; 30: 294-301.  
42  
43  
44  
45 45. Kilkenny Monique F, Lannin Natasha A, Anderson Craig S, et al. Quality of Life Is  
46 Poorer for Patients With Stroke Who Require an Interpreter. *Stroke* 2018; 49: 761-  
47 764. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.019771.  
48  
49  
50  
51 46. Thayabaranathan T, Andrew NE, Kilkenny MF, et al. Factors influencing self-  
52 reported anxiety or depression following stroke or TIA using linked registry and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 hospital data. *Quality of Life Research* 2018; 27: 3145-3155. DOI: 10.1007/s11136-  
4 018-1960-y.  
5  
6  
7  
8 47. Kim H-Y. Statistical notes for clinical researchers: effect size. *Restor Dent Endod*  
9  
10 2015; 40: 328-331. 2015/10/02. DOI: 10.5395/rde.2015.40.4.328.  
11  
12 48. Schwamm L, Reeves MJ, Frankel M. Designing a Sustainable National Registry for  
13  
14 Stroke Quality Improvement, *Am J Prevent Med* 2006; 31: S251-S257. DOI:  
15  
16 10.1016/j.amepre.2006.08.013.  
17  
18  
19  
20 49. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Admitted patient care 2017-18: Australian  
21  
22 hospital statistics, [https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/hospitals/admitted-patient-care-](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/hospitals/admitted-patient-care-2017-18/contents/at-a-glance)  
23  
24 [2017-18/contents/at-a-glance](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/hospitals/admitted-patient-care-2017-18/contents/at-a-glance) (2019).  
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

## Online Supplement 1 - Co-investigators and other contributors to the Australian Stroke Clinical Registry

The following people are acknowledged for their contribution to collecting hospital data on the patients registered in AuSCR or their participation on various governance committees between 2010 and 2015:

### Steering and Management Committee

**Craig Anderson** PhD (Royal Prince Alfred Hospital NSW, site investigator, The George Institute for Global Health University of New South Wales NSW, The George Institute for Global Health at Peking University Health Science Center China); **Dominique Cadilhac** PhD (Stroke and Ageing Research, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University VIC, Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC, Data Custodian); **Geoffrey Donnan** MD (Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC); **Rohan Grimley** MBBS (Gympie Hospital QLD, Nambour General Hospital QLD, site investigator, Sunshine Coast Clinical School, University of Queensland QLD); **Peter Hand** MBBS, MD, FRACP (Royal Melbourne Hospital VIC, site investigator)

### Steering Committee

**Julie Bernhardt** PhD (The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC); **Paul Bew** MPhy (The Prince Charles Hospital QLD); **Christopher Bladin** MD, MBBS, FRACP (Box Hill Hospital VIC, site investigator); **Greg Cadigan** BN (Queensland State-wide Stroke Clinical Network QLD); **Helen Castley** MBBS (Royal Hobart Hospital Tasmania, site investigator); **Andrew Evans** MBBS (Hons), FRACP (Westmead Hospital NSW); **Susan Hillier** PhD (University of South Australia, SA); **Erin Lalor** PhD (Stroke Foundation VIC); **Andrew Lee** MBBS FRACP (Flinders Medical Centre, South Australia); **Richard Lindley** PhD (The George Institute for Global Health NSW); **Mark Mackay** MBBS, FRACP (Royal Children's Hospital VIC, site investigator); **Sandra Martyn** (Health Statistics Centre Queensland Health QLD); **John McNeil** PhD (Monash University VIC); **Sandy Middleton** PhD (Nursing Research Institute, St Vincent's Health Australia NSW, Australian Catholic University NSW); **Michael Pollack** MBBS, FAFRM (RACP), FACRM, FFPM (ANZCA), MMedSci (Clin Epi) (Hunter Stroke Service NSW); **Mark Simcocks** BSc (VIC, Consumer Representative); **Frances Simmonds** MSc(Med), (Australasian Rehabilitation Outcomes Centre NSW); **Amanda Thrift** PhD (Stroke and Ageing Research, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University VIC); **Andrew Wesseldine** MBBS, FRACP (St John of God Healthcare; Department of Health WA)

### Management Committee

**Helen Dewey** PhD (Austin Hospital VIC, Box Hill Hospital VIC, site investigator, Eastern Health Clinical School, Monash University VIC); **Steven Faux** FAFRM (RACP) (St Vincent's Health Australia NSW); **Kelvin Hill** BAppSci (Stroke Foundation VIC); **Natasha Lannin** PhD (Faculty of Health Sciences, La Trobe University VIC, Occupational Therapy Department, Alfred Health VIC); **Christopher Levi** PhD (Acute Stroke Services, John Hunter Hospital NSW, site investigator); **Christopher Price** BSocW BSc (National Stroke Foundation)



## Site Investigators

**Lauren Arthurson** BSpPath, MHIthServMt (Echuca Regional Health VIC); **Pradeep Bambery** MD, FRCP(G), FRACP (Bundaberg Hospital QLD); **Tim Bates** MBBS, FRACP (Swan District Hospital WA); **Carolyn Beltrame** RN (Div1) (Latrobe Regional Hospital VIC); **David Blacker** MBBS, FRACP (Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital WA); **Ernie Butler** MBBS FRACP (Peninsula Health VIC); **Sean Butler** FIMLS, BM Hons, MRCP(UK), FRACP (Prince Charles Hospital QLD); **Chris Charnley** MBBS (Warrnambool Base Hospital VIC); **Jo Cotterell** BPhysio (Mildura Base Hospital VIC); **Douglas Crompton** MA, PhD, MBBS, FRACP (Northern Hospital VIC); **Vanessa Crosby** Dip Physio (Albury-Wodonga Health VIC); **Carolyn De Wytt** MRCP (UK), MB BCH DUBL, FRACP (Greenslopes Private Hospital QLD); **David Douglas** MBBS, M Admin, FRACGP, FAFRM (RACP) (Ipswich Hospital QLD); **Martin Dunlop** MBBS, FACRM (Cairns Base Hospital QLD); **Paula Easton** BPhy (Hons) (Mackay Hospital QLD); **Sharan Ermel** RN (Div1) (Bendigo Health VIC); **Nisal Gange** MBBS, AMC CERT (Toowoomba Hospital QLD); **Richard Geraghty** MBBS, FRACP (Redcliffe Hospital QLD); **Melissa Gill** BAppSc (SpPath) (Armidale Hospital, NSW); **Graham Hall** MBBS, FRACP (Princess Alexandra Hospital QLD); **Geoffrey Herkes** MBBS, PhD, FRACP (Royal North Shore Hospital NSW); **Karen Hines** BHIM (Caboolture Hospital QLD); **Francis Hishon** RN (Redland Hospital QLD); **James Hughes** BMed, FRACP (Tamworth Hospital NSW); **Joel Iedema** MBBS, FRACP (Redland Hospital QLD); **Martin Jude** MBBS, FRACP (Wagga Wagga Hospital NSW); **Thomas Kraemer** Approbation als Arzt, STATE EXAM MED MUNSTER, FRACP (Ballarat Health Services VIC); **Paul Laird** MBBS, FRACP (Rockhampton Hospital QLD); **Johanna Madden** BPhysio (Goulburn Valley Health VIC); **Graham Mahaffey** RN (Hervey Bay Hospital QLD); **Suzana Milosevic** MD, FRACP, AMC CERT (Logan Hospital QLD); **Peter O'Brien** MBBS, DIP RANZCOG, FRACMA, FACRRM (Warrnambool Hospital VIC); **Trisha Oxley** RN/RM, MANP (Critical Care) (Swan Hill District Health VIC); **Michaela Plante** RN (Div 1) (Rockhampton Hospital QLD); **Juan Rois-Gnecco** Medico Cirujano Javeriana, FAFRM (Ipswich Hospital QLD); **Stephen Read** MBBS, PhD, FRACP (Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital QLD); **Kristen Rowe** BNurs, Cert NeuroSci Nurs (Austin Health VIC); **Fiona Ryan** BAppSc (SpPath), MHIthSc (Orange Hospital and Bathurst Hospitals NSW); **Arman Sabet** MD, FRACP, BSc (Gold Coast Hospital and Robina Hospital QLD); **Noel Saines** MBBS, FRACP (The Wesley Hospital QLD); **Eva Salud** MD, AMC CERT (Gympie Hospital QLD); **Amanda Siller** MBBS, FRACP (Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital QLD); **Christopher Staples** MD (Mater Adults QLD); **Amanda Styles** RN (Div 1) (Armidale Hospital NSW); **Judith Walloscheck** MBA (Bendigo Health VIC); **Richard White** MD, FRCP, FRACP. (Townsville Hospital QLD); **Andrew Wong** MBBS, PhD (Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital QLD); **Lillian Wong** MBBS FRACP (Logan Hospital QLD)

## Staff at The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health VIC

Robin Armstrong, Leonid Churilov, Alison Dias, Kelly Drennan, Adele Gibbs, Brenda Grabsch, Jen Holland, Monique Kilkenny, Joosup Kim, Charlotte Krenus, Francis Kung, Joyce Lim, Karen Moss, Kate Paice, Enna Salama, Sam Shehata, Sabrina Small, Renee Stojanovic, Steven Street, Emma Tod, Kasey Wallis, Julia Watt

## Staff at Monash University VIC

Nadine Andrew

**Online Supplement 2 – Queensland Specific Care Processes**

Care Process	Urban <i>n</i> (%)	Rural <i>n</i> (%)	p-value
Mobilised during admission	2,876 (69.3)	1,950 (80.1)	<0.001
Swallow screen or assessment	4,952 (74.2)	3,676 (83.5)	<0.001
Aspirin within 48h, if ischaemic	3,393 (68.2)	2,843 (75.8)	<0.001
Discharged on antithrombotic medication, if ischaemic	3,823 (80.1)	2,694 (86.7)	<0.001

For peer review only



**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cross-sectional studies**

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	7-8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	7-8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	8
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	11
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	13
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11-14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	2

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).