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Background There is a lack of defined levels of rehabilitation, indicating possibly random content and access to specialized services.

Aims and/or hypothesis The aim of the study was to perform a multinational descriptive study of specialized rehabilitation in persons with stroke, to elucidate what the different centers define as prerequisites for specialized rehabilitation, and to analyze whether these descriptions map to currently applied standards or constructs of specialized rehabilitation. A secondary aim was to look for similarities and differences between therapies and services for persons with stroke in the sub-acute stage in the different institutions.

Methods Descriptive data of the collaborating centers regarding structure and processes of services were recorded and compared with the British Society of Rehabilitation Medicine and Specialized Services National Definitions sets.

Results Comparisons of the definitions showed that all centers admitted severely disabled persons with stroke, in need of complex rehabilitation, and provided high levels of physical services, with specialized equipment and facilities. However, funding, size, university affiliation, quality accreditation, staffing levels, specialist training, cognitive and vocational services, coordination of the professional teams, admission procedures, time and type of therapies, estimated length of stay, and follow-up procedures differed between the centers.

Conclusion This multinational study of specialized stroke rehabilitation centers shows that a universal definition of specialized rehabilitation is possible, even in quite different countries and settings, in terms of general principles. There were however differences in structures and procedures, which may influence patients’ outcomes, indicating a need for refinement of the definitions to be globally applicable.
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Introduction

It is estimated that 15 million people worldwide suffer a stroke each year (1,2). Stroke is the leading cause of serious long-term disability (3). Approximately one-third of stroke survivors will have permanent disability after their stroke (1,4). Consequently, many individuals with stroke are in need of specialized services and specialized rehabilitation.

Specialized rehabilitation has been defined by the British Society of Rehabilitation Medicine (BSRM) as ‘services that support patients with complex disability, whose rehabilitation needs are beyond the scope of their local rehabilitation services’ (5–7). Relatively few rehabilitation centers for persons with stroke can be defined as specialized in accordance with the BSRM’s definition, and those that may be in line with the definitions may differ regarding content both within a country and between different countries (8). This lack of defined levels of rehabilitation, indicating random content and access to specialized services, signals a need for more information about content and the effectiveness of services provided, to obtain a basic understanding of how and what special rehabilitation should be, and how specialized rehabilitation might be developed to benefit patients.

A descriptive study of specialized rehabilitation should preferably be undertaken in a cross-cultural setting to allow comparisons between countries (9,10). Sunnaas Rehabilitation Hospital in Norway has initiated a multinational comparative descriptive study on the content of specialized stroke rehabilitation with partners from nine rehabilitation centers in seven countries: Norway, China, the United States, Russia, Palestine, Israel, and Sweden.

Thus, this is a multinational descriptive study of specialized rehabilitation for persons with stroke. The aims are to elucidate what the different centers define as prerequisites for specialized rehabilitation and to analyze whether these descriptions map to currently applied standards or theoretical constructs of specialized rehabilitation. Furthermore, the services for persons with stroke in the sub-acute stage are presented from the different institutions, to look for similarities and differences in practice.

The study was registered in Clinical trials Gov: NCT01732679.

Ethics

Approval of the local ethical committees in each country was obtained in 2012, including from the Regional Ethics Committee of Health South-East in Norway (2012/768). Information on the
aim of the study was given to the participants’ both verbally and in writing, and written informed consent was obtained.

Materials and methods
Design
The design was a prospective, descriptive study of specialized rehabilitation for persons with stroke, in nine rehabilitation centers, in seven countries. The characteristics of the participating centers were described, such as structure and process of services, therapies provided, and the principles for admission and discharge.

Data collection
Structured questionnaire
A structured questionnaire was developed which included questions of general descriptions of the specialized rehabilitation unit. This ensured descriptions of the participating centers, and mapping onto the analytical tools the BSRM definition of specialized rehabilitation (5) and Specialized Services National Definitions (SSND) sets for tertiary rehabilitation (6,7) could be readily compared (Appendix S1). The head of each center answered the questions. The contact persons in each clinic presented the description of each center at a workshop, where the described content was discussed, and consensus regarding the interpretation was reached (Fig. 1). The patients with stroke were assessed with the Modified Rankin Scale on admission, and a score of 3–5 was considered to be the target population for specialized rehabilitation (11,12).

Video film
The project coordinator and assistants (BL, SS, MH) also visited the participating centers (n = 8) to do on-site video documenta-

Fig. 1 Study progress of descriptive data collection of specialized rehabilitation.
tion of the rehabilitation locations, therapies, and procedures. However, one center could not be visited due to political circumstances and documentary pictures were sent by the clinic. The videos complement data from the questionnaires describing the content of rehabilitation in the respective centers. The participants have approved the videos.

**Analysis**

The participating centers’ descriptions were mapped to the BSRM’s standards of specialized rehabilitation (Fig. 2) (5), and SSND sets to analyze to what extent they coincided (Fig. 3) (6,7) (Appendices S2 and S3).

**Qualitative analysis**

The structured questionnaire, the interviews, and the material from the workshops were analyzed qualitatively through comparative text analyses (13). Two of the co-authors (B. L., S. S.) performed the analyses in five stages: reading, interpreting, searching for similarities and differences, synthesizing into categories, and reaching consensus (13). In addition, three collaborators (B. L., S. S., and M. H.) analyzed the video material. A score, yes = 1, no = 0, and partly = 0·5, for each presented characteristics was set to quantify the theoretical framework BSRM and SSND. A total agreement would give 10 and 6 points, respectively.

**Statistical analysis**

Quantitative data are presented with descriptive statistics, mean, and standard deviation for comparisons of performance on admission (14).

**Results**

**Structure**

None of the participating centers obtained the maximum score for specialized rehabilitation as defined by the modified BSRM (Table 1a) (5). The highest score was obtained by Sahlgrenska (Sweden), followed by Rusk (United States), Sunnaas (Norway), Sheba (Israel), and CRRC (China). El Wafa (Palestine), Policlinica no. 2 (Russia), BASR (Palestine), and Sichuan Bayi (China) obtained the lowest score among all participating countries.

Common for all centers were the selection of patients with complex disability for admission. The clinics had a minimum of three categories of rehabilitation staff and all used special equipment in rehabilitation (5).
Two centers, CRRC (China) and Sheba Medical hospital (Israel), were in line with all criteria in the modified SSND (6), which aims to define tertiary specialized rehabilitation service levels (Table 1b).

The participating centers varied in size, staffing levels, and number of beds devoted to stroke rehabilitation (Table 2 and 3). Admission criteria in all centers were persons with stroke in need of complex rehabilitation services. A majority of the centers received sub-acute patients; they were located away from the emergency hospital and had national (n = 2), regional (n = 8), and local (n = 7) intake of patients (Table 2). Three out of the nine centers also admitted medically unstable patients (Table 4). Patients admitted to the different centers had all moderate to severe disability, with an mRS score 3–4.

Standardized follow-up procedures after discharge differed; some had standardized control visits after discharge (n = 2), some practiced ‘according to needs’, and four centers had no follow-up procedures (Table 4).

All centers provided rehabilitation with specialized equipment and in specialized facilities with a minimum of three categories of staff (Table 5). The majority of the centers (n = 7) provided higher levels of rehabilitation, as defined by SSND, to patients regardless of age and used standardized outcome measures.

None of the centers used standardized specified goals for rehabilitation. Only three countries had developed national guidelines based on evidence-based medicine/practice. Another three countries referred to national consensus guidelines, and three countries did not refer to any standards of rehabilitation (Table 5).

Funding of rehabilitation varied. The majority had public funding (n = 6), while others had private funding (n = 3). In addition, some centers charged additional fees for specific services. This practice was optional in two centers, mandatory in one center, and depending on the patients’ financial situation in another (Table 2).

Five of the nine centers collaborated with educational institutions (Table 2). Four of the nine centers were accredited rehabilitation facilities by the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) (15); the same centers also scored highest on the BSRM evaluation (Tables 1a and 2). The description of therapy, the use of different approaches, and the length of time in therapy also varied widely between the centers.

### Process of services

All centers had a multidisciplinary team, with a medical doctors (MD), nurses (RN), physiotherapist (PT), occupational therapist (OT), and psychologists (Table 3). However, the staff per rehabili-
tation bed varied (Table 2). Speech therapists and social workers were not always part of these teams (Table 3).

Participating centers were well equipped. The exercise equipment appeared old fashioned in some and very modern in others. However, the equipment was functional and served its purpose.

Standard therapy in all centers was the combination of PT and OT. The patients spend most therapy time on these activities. However, specific time spent in therapy varied between centers from 20 to 180 min per day. Complementary services reported as ‘other’ (horse-riding, gardening, music therapy, etc.) were mainly related to PT and OT activities.

In the majority of the centers, speech therapy, psychological help, prosthetics, and assistance from a social worker were optional therapies, only used when needed. Therapy time varied between 30 and 60 min.

Variations in frequency, intensity, time, and type varied widely between the centers. Frequency of PT and OT was daily in seven of the nine centers. Intensity of the therapies was not standardized in any of the centers. Total time in all the therapies varied from two- to five-hours per day.

### Discussion

#### Specialized rehabilitation – structure

Compared with the definitions for specialized rehabilitation (5–7), none of the participating centers obtained the maximum score possible, although four out of the nine were close (Table 1a,b). The result indicates that a universal definition of specialized rehabilitation is possible even in countries that are quite different in terms of admission criteria, multidisciplinary structures, and local conditions.

---

**Table 1** (a) Rehabilitation in the participating clinics and British Society of Rehabilitation Medicine (BSRM) and (b) rehabilitation, analyzed according to the Specialized Services National Definitions set (SSND) and ‘Tertiary Specialized Rehabilitation Service’ (10), in the participating clinics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Rehabilitation in the participating clinics and BSRM</th>
<th>Sunnaas</th>
<th>CRRC</th>
<th>Rusk Inst</th>
<th>Policlinica 2</th>
<th>Sheba</th>
<th>BASR</th>
<th>El Wafa</th>
<th>Högsbo</th>
<th>Sichuan Bayi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-professional team who have undergone recognized specialist training in rehabilitation</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led or supported by a consultant trained and accredited in rehabilitation medicine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A coordinated inter-disciplinary team</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working toward a set of goals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take patients with more complex rehabilitation needs than non-specialist services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have specialist equipment and facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing levels to meet those needs</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical data defined by the national dataset for specialist rehabilitation services are collected and reported annually for all patients</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local teams in hospital and community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a recognized role in education, training in the field of rehabilitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total points = 10</td>
<td>7 5/10</td>
<td>6 5/10</td>
<td>8 5/10</td>
<td>2 5/10</td>
<td>7 5/10</td>
<td>2 5/10</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>9 5/10</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Rehabilitation, analyzed according to the SSND set and Tertiary Specialized Rehabilitation Service in the participating clinics

| Service lead by a consultant trained and accredited in rehabilitation medicine and/or neuropsychiatry depending on caseload | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Covers a population >1 million patients, therefore requires collaborative commissioning | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Caters for people whose needs are beyond the scope of the local specialist services, and therefore has a high proportion of patients with very complex rehabilitation needs | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Provides higher level of services in terms of specialist expertise, facilities, and program intensity to meet those needs | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Also plays a networking role which includes: Supporting local specialist and general teams in the management of complex cases | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Acts as a resource for research and development, as well as education and training | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| Total score = 6 | 5/6 | 6/6 | 5/6 | 2/6 | 6/6 | 4/6 | 3/6 | 4/6 | 4/6 |

A score for each characteristic was given: yes = 1, no = 0 and partly = 0.5. Partly was rendered if some parts of the criteria was fulfilled.
Table 2 Descriptives of the participating institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunnaas</th>
<th>CRRC</th>
<th>Rusk rehab</th>
<th>Pol. clin 2</th>
<th>Sheba</th>
<th>BASR</th>
<th>El Wafa</th>
<th>Högsbo</th>
<th>Sichuan Bayi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financing</strong></td>
<td>Subacute</td>
<td>Acute and subacute*</td>
<td>Subacute</td>
<td>Acute and subacute*</td>
<td>Subacute</td>
<td>Subacute</td>
<td>Subacute</td>
<td>Subacute</td>
<td>Subacute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient population</strong></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public National, regional, and local</td>
<td>Public Regional and local</td>
<td>Public Regional and local</td>
<td>Public Regional and local</td>
<td>Public Regional and local</td>
<td>Public Regional and local</td>
<td>Public Regional and local</td>
<td>Public Regional and local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University affiliation</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARF accreditation</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehab financed</strong></td>
<td>Government:</td>
<td>Health, commercial insurance or private: governmental 180 days rehab</td>
<td>Medicare (federal): time limited</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medical insurance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patients’ own share</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some therapies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beds total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of beds</strong></td>
<td>130/40</td>
<td>250 Stroke</td>
<td>36/12</td>
<td>NA†</td>
<td>36/12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17/12</td>
<td>50 Stroke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participating institutions: Sunnaas Rehabilitation Hospital (Sunnaas) in Norway, China Rehabilitation Research Center (CRRC) in PR China, Rusk Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine (Rusk Rehab) in United States, Policlinic no 2 Petrozavodsk (Pol. clin 2) in Russia, Sheba Medical Center (Sheba) in Israel, Bethlehem Arab Society Rehabilitation (BASR) in Palestine, El Wafa in Palestine, Högsbo Rehabilitation Hospital (Högsbo) in Sweden, and Sichuan Bayi, China. Data were collected through administrators/leaders of the respective clinics.

*Acute and sub-acute = medically unstable.
†Outpatient clinic.

CARF, Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities.
therapy. In organizations where patients paid for the services, the 'expert' or combined 'expert and patient'-driven models for rehabilitation were reimbursed via health insurance, through taxes, private insurance, or through charitable donations. The different financial organization may be one of several possible reasons for the observed differences in rehabilitation models. Centers that were specialized personnel working in those centers (17–19). In most of the participating centers, the professionals had a diploma or bachelor level and no further specialization. This reduced the score for the item ‘the recognized role in education, training in the field of rehabilitation’. Furthermore, a more evidence-based practice (EBP) might be expected in centers with a higher degree of specialization personnel (20).

Another reason for a decreased score was that many centers did not routinely use outcome measures to set goals in the clinic (Table 1a, b). Outcome measures were only used regularly in Sahlgrenska, Rusk, Sheba, and Sunnaas. This is probably worth discussing to improve rehabilitation services (21,22). It highlights the need to objectively evaluate progress in patient outcomes with standardized tests that are developed for global use and appropriate for different cultural settings (23).

Rehabilitation was funded in three ways: public/government, private insurance, or through charitable donations. The different financial organization may be one of several possible reasons for the observed differences in rehabilitation models. Centers that were reimbursed via health insurance, through taxes, private funding, or company schemes were more prone to follow ‘expert’ or combined ‘expert and patient’-driven models for therapy. In organizations where patients paid for the services, the choices, to a greater degree, were based on patients’ preferences and by their perceived needs. These structural differences, embedded in the various health-care systems, and existing contextual differences in the organization of rehabilitation units have also been pointed out in other studies (8,24–26).

The differences in funding may have had a direct influence on LOS and on services rendered. The rehabilitation centers, independent of private or public funding, where all services were included in the fee, may seem in that respect socially more equal. Otherwise, economic and social differences may influence who has access to the more expensive services.

Services were, as was earlier pointed out, based on experts’ evaluation of the patients’ needs, rather than on the clients’ own evaluation. It is not known whether these procedures have a negative influence on user involvement and self-efficacy. Only one center provided annual reports to a national data set, Web Rehab (27). This may reflect the paucity of guidelines and stakeholders’ demands that exists on an international and national level for specialized rehabilitation (28).

Participating centers were all well equipped, reflecting the complex rehabilitation needs that were to be met. There were differences in rehabilitation remedies, like traditional Chinese medicine vs. Western medicine, reflecting cultural differences (29). However, it might also be a reflection of different views on evidence-based medicine or purely economic realities (30).

The centers CRRC, Rusk, Policlinica no 2, Sheba, BASR, El Wafa, and Bayi Sichuan represented more expert-driven centers, where the professionals did the evaluations and decided the therapies in joint meetings consisting only of professionals. The patients’ interests and their ability to influence the treatment were incorporated in their communication with the professionals. The organization of services was parallel; each department organized independently of one another with weekly meetings between professionals to adjust therapies according to progress and patients’ needs.

On the other hand, Sunnaas and Sahlgrenska represented centers where therapies incorporated the patients and their families’ goals and interests through dialogue with the team coordinator and the experts in addition to the experts’ evaluation and advice. In these centers, therapies were also organized in parallel settings, but in close collaboration with the nursing staff, who

**Table 3 Descriptive therapy personnel in the participating clinics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunnaas</th>
<th>CRRC</th>
<th>Rusk</th>
<th>Pol. clin. 2</th>
<th>Sheba</th>
<th>BASR</th>
<th>El Wafa</th>
<th>Høgsbo</th>
<th>Sichuan</th>
<th>Bayi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Professional*</td>
<td>MD†</td>
<td>Professional*</td>
<td>MD‡</td>
<td>MD§</td>
<td>MD†</td>
<td>MD§</td>
<td>MD†</td>
<td>MD‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant nurses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical therapist/assistant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational therapist/assistant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6/2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech therapist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff per rehab bed (min 1 95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from questionnaires and interviews with leaders and contact persons.
*Physical therapist. †Neurologist/medical rehab/orthopedic. ‡Occupational therapist. §Staff/per daily patients.
Table 4 Admission criteria and follow-up procedure for the participating institutions, from questionnaires and interviews with leaders and contact persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission criteria</th>
<th>Sunnaas CRRC</th>
<th>Rusk Inst Pol. clin. 2</th>
<th>Sheba BASR</th>
<th>El Wafa</th>
<th>Högbo</th>
<th>Sichuan Bayi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients status</td>
<td>Complex impairment*</td>
<td>Complex impairment</td>
<td>Need for inpatient rehabilitation</td>
<td>Need for complex rehabilitation</td>
<td>Complex impairment, in need of inpatient rehabilitation</td>
<td>Complex impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medically stable</td>
<td>Medically stable and unstable</td>
<td>Ability to participate in active rehab</td>
<td>Medically stable</td>
<td>Medically stable and unstable</td>
<td>Medically stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to participate in active rehab</td>
<td>Able to participate in active rehab</td>
<td>Ability to participate in active rehab</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Hope of functional improvement</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to return to an active lifestyle</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Potential to return to an active lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized procedure follow-up post stroke</td>
<td>Yes, 12 months post-rehab</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, according to needs</td>
<td>Yes, according to needs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Complex impairment = motor and/or cognitive disability. †Complex/inpatient rehabilitation refers to services available: physical, cognitive, and social.

The results indicate that the participating centers practiced some different models of cooperation within the rehabilitation team. There are no standards for the composition of the multidisciplinary team and its size. In the participating centers, therapists and other professionals worked efficiently in parallel settings. The questionsnaires, meetings, workshops, and visits disclosed that therapy services, including physical and active treatment, were actively taking part in the rehabilitation processes. Translating therapies into activities on the wards. This enhanced variability and duration of exercise, and led to higher self-efficacy and preparation and duration of exercise (8). The intensity of the therapies was not standardized in any of the centers. Repetitions, perceived 'difficulty'/ 'loading', and variations in the intensity of the therapies did not seem to be issues that were discussed. Rather, the intensity was considered a subjective entity relating to the individual patient, where OTs and PTs practiced activities on the wards with the patients. The intensity of the therapies was not standardized in any of the centers. Repetitions, perceived 'difficulty'/ 'loading', and variations in the intensity of the therapies did not seem to be issues that were discussed. Rather, the intensity was considered a subjective entity relating to the individual patient.
scribe therapies, add therapies of their own choices and perceived needs, in collaboration with the MDs. This choice depended on what they could and could not afford. The experts delivered services efficiently, in a parallel organization with little communication between different professions.

Therapy rooms also seemed to signal what type of therapy school the center practiced. The type of therapy varied; from working on tables and mats, or in functional rooms with activities like gardening, kitchen activities, or big areas for walking practice, group training, and outdoors. Therapies also varied in the use of passive and active therapy remedies. Different methods have been practiced in rehabilitation, often with little reference to EBP, depending more on the explicit and tacit knowledge and assumptions of the particular therapists (34–42). These different approaches reflect the diversity of rehabilitation as a whole.

Prerequisites for specialized rehabilitation and to what extent these prerequisites mapped to standards was the main aim of this paper. The standards BSRM and SSND were in fact the only tools found that have operationalized the difference and are to a certain extent overlapping. Three key issues defined in both documents could be mapped from the descriptions: Admittance of stroke patients with very complex rehabilitation needs, similar categories of rehabilitation staff, and adequate special equipment for rehabilitation were universal throughout centers. Therefore, despite large cultural, political, and juridical differences between countries, it seems advisable to define international standards for stroke rehabilitation in general and specialized rehabilitation in particular, for the sub-acute period after stroke. Centers with CARF accreditation following universal standards seem to provide stroke rehabilitation services in agreement with EBP. As CARF is an international organization, this emphasizes the need for further international cooperation to improve specialized rehabilitation services even more around the globe (13).

However, a further refinement of standards would include structures and procedures like time from debut to admission, and more detailed parameters for therapy content and dose in terms of frequency, intensity, time, and type on a general basis. The strength of this study is the description from a wide range of rehabilitation institutions in a multicultural and multicenter study. A weakness of a multicenter/multicultural study is perhaps the language and communication challenges. Misinterpretations may arise in the process of mapping and comparing to standards. An effort was made to minimize these challenges by striving for a transparent and friendly process, and by including elements of validation in terms of meetings and discussions in progression with the study.

**Conclusion**

This multinational study of specialized stroke rehabilitation in nine centers from seven countries shows that a universal definition of specialized rehabilitation is possible, and may be desirable to enhance evidence-based rehabilitation practice for persons with stroke. All centers admitted persons with stroke and complex rehabilitation needs, similar categories of rehabilitation staff, and adequate special equipment for rehabilitation. There were, however, differences in structures and procedures, which may influence patients’ outcomes, indicating a need for refinement of the definition of specialized rehabilitation to be globally applicable.
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