medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Disparities After Discharge: The Association of Limited English Proficiency and Post-Discharge Patient Reported Issues

Lev Malevanchik, MD (1); Margaret Wheeler (2); Kristin Gagliardi (2); Leah Karliner, MD (3); Sachin J. Shah, MD, MPH (1, 2)

1. Division of Hospital Medicine, University of California, San Francisco
2. Office of Population Health, UCSF Health
3. Multiethnic Health Equity Research Center, Division of General Internal Medicine, University of California, San Francisco

Corresponding Author:
Lev Malevanchik, MD
Division of Hospital Medicine
University of California, San Francisco
533 Parnassus Ave U127, San Francisco CA 94143
Email: lev.malevanchik@ucsf.edu
Tel: 858-245-6021

Main text word count: 2850
Abstract word count: 341
Tables and Figures: 2 tables, 2 figures

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Importance: Patients with limited English proficiency (LEP) experience worse outcomes following hospital discharge. Care transition programs are common, yet little known about the disparities in quality (process and outcome measures) experienced by patients with LEP.

Objective: To determine the association of LEP and care transition quality

Design: A retrospective cohort study, from May 1, 2018, to April 30, 2019

Setting: A population health program within an urban, academic medical center. The care transition program used multilingual, automated telephonic outreach to assess patient-reported issues three days post discharge.

Participants: All adults discharged home from the hospital during the study period who were not part of a bundled payments program

Exposure: Limited English proficiency

Main outcomes: Process measures (reach rate, time to address patient reported issue) and outcome measures (discharge instructions questions, difficulty obtaining prescriptions, medication concerns, follow up care questions, new or worsening symptoms, any other clinical issues).

Results: 13,860 patients were included in the study; 11% had LEP. The program reached most patients regardless of LEP status but was less likely to reach patients with LEP (average marginal effect [AME] 3.3%; 95% CI, 1.4% to 5.1%). After adjustment, patients with LEP reported high rates of all measured patient-reported outcomes: discharge instruction (AME 4.8%; 95% CI, 2.7% to 6.9%), obtaining prescriptions (AME 2.9%; 95% CI, 0.6% to 5.1%), medications concerns (AME 2.3%; 95% CI, 0.0% to 4.6%), follow up questions (AME 2.8%; 95% CI, 0.3% to 5.3%), new or worsening symptoms (AME 3.2%; 95% CI, 0.7% to 5.8%), and any other clinical issues (AME 3.6%; 95% CI, 1.1% to 6.1%). When issues were identified, the association between LEP and time to resolution of an issue was statistically, but not clinically, significant.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conclusion and Relevance: Among patients with LEP, substantial disparities exist in patient-reported post-discharge outcome measures indicating a need for better discharge processes that focus on quality and health equity. Following discharge, relatively minor disparities were observed in the processes of a care transitions program that supports non-English languages.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Patients with limited English proficiency (LEP) commonly face barriers in communicating with their clinicians and understanding their treatment plans.[1] These barriers are particularly problematic in the hospital, where patients with LEP are more likely to suffer adverse events, have higher mortality rates, and have higher readmission rates than English proficient (EP) patients.[2,3] While prior studies have documented in-hospital adverse events, the experience of patients with LEP during and after hospital discharge is not well understood.

The transition from hospital to home is a vulnerable period for all patients,[4,5] especially for those who have LEP.[6] To identify and address issues that arise during this transition, hospitals have implemented programs to contact all recently discharged patients routinely. These programs have been shown to improve patient satisfaction and increase post-discharge medication adherence.[7] To reach discharged patients efficiently, care transition programs have increasingly relied on technological solutions such as automated phone calls and text messages. Whether such tools effectively reach those with LEP is not known; however, evidence from prior technology implementation suggests that new technologies tend to widen healthcare disparities.[8,9]

Additionally, little is known about the issues and barriers that patients with LEP face after hospital discharge. Although one study found that patients with LEP have poor comprehension of hospital discharge instructions,[10] other dimensions of the care transition such as worsening symptoms, difficulty obtaining prescriptions, or issues taking medications have not been described.

To address these two knowledge gaps in the care of patients with LEP, we examined data from a care transitions outreach program at a large academic medical center. Our first goal was to evaluate whether the program's technology and processes reached patients with LEP and EP (English proficiency) equally. Our second goal was to measure the prevalence of post-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

discharge, patient-reported issues, and their association with English proficiency.

Methods

Design, Setting, Subjects

We performed a retrospective cohort study of patients 18 years or older discharged home from an academic medical center between May 1, 2018, and April 30, 2019. We included all patients who were discharged home from participating clinical services and were not part of a bundled payments program that coordinated post-discharge care separately. We excluded patients discharged with home hospice (1.2%), lacking a listed telephone number (0.4%), were admitted for less than one day (0.5%), were readmitted to the same hospital within 72 hours (1.8%) or were missing any administrative data (2.7%). 5.4% of discharges were excluded from the CTOP program for reasons that were not documented (**Appendix-1**). For patients with multiple admissions during the study period, we examined the first discharge.

The Care Transitions Outreach Program

The study site implemented a hospital-wide care transitions outreach program in March 2017. The program's goal was universal contact with all patients discharged from the hospital to identify and address care transition problems. In their discharge instructions (written in English), patients were notified that they would receive an automated call within 72 hours of discharge. A third party (CipherHealth Voice, New York, NY) delivered a scripted, automated call to ask patients if they had questions or concerns in six post-discharge domains. The program called all patients regardless of their reported language preference. Respondents could choose to hear and respond to the questions in English, Spanish, or Cantonese, the three most common languages spoken by patients in the health system. The Appendix provides the complete text of the script (**Appendix-2**).

The automated calling program attempted to call patients up to five times per day for two

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

consecutive days. If a patient failed to answer the automated call and met any of the following specific criteria—age >85 years, discharged home with home services, limited English proficiency, or part of the study site's Medicare accountable care organization—a centralized care transition nurse would review the patient's chart and call the patient manually if they had not already been contacted or seen by a clinician or their staff. If a patient did answer the automated call initially and identified an issue, the care transition nurse would call the patient manually to follow up. In either situation, the nurse would use a professional language interpreter if they were not fluent in the patient's preferred language.

Measures: Limited English proficiency

There is no gold standard for defining limited English proficiency. We classified patients as having limited English proficiency (LEP) if in the electronic medical record (EMR), their preferred language for healthcare was a language other than English and if they self-identified as needing an interpreter. This definition was validated through chart review in a prior study conducted at the same institution[3]. In that study, compared to the chart reviewers' assessment of English proficiency, the definition had a positive predictive value of 100%; thus, any misclassification in this study would err on the side of categorizing patients with LEP as EP. Preferred language and need for an interpreter were obtained on registration and directly reflected the patients' stated responses.

Measures: Sociodemographics and clinical comorbidities

We obtained demographic and clinical data using structured elements from the EMR. Using administrative data we determined patients' discharge diagnoses with International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-10-CM) diagnosis codes; we used these codes to calculate the Elixhauser score for each patient.[11]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Outcomes: Reach rate

We classified "patient reach" into one of four mutually exclusive, hierarchical categories. If a patient was able to answer the automated call and at least one clinical question, we classified them as having "answered an automated call." If a patient did not answer the automated call but was contacted a clinician or their staff, we classified them as having been "contacted by a clinician." For patients who neither answered the automated calls nor were reached by clinicians, the care transition nurses attempted to reach the patients who met the criteria listed above with up to three manual phone calls. If the nurses successfully reached a patient by manual call, we classified them as having been "reached by a manual call." We classified patients as "not reached" if the automated calls, clinicians, and the care transitions nurses were unable to reach them.

Outcomes: Patient-reported, post-discharge issues

The care transitions outreach program asked patients about six post-discharge issues: questions about their discharge instructions, difficulty getting their prescriptions, medication concerns, questions about follow up care, new or worsening symptoms, or any other clinical issues not already addressed (specific questions listed in **Appendix-2**).

In sensitivity analyses, we further characterized the severity of issues in two ways. First, following an outreach call, care transition nurses noted the urgency of reported issues using templated documentation, and categorized these from least to most urgent as follows: the nurse counseled the patient on the phone, the nurse notified a clinician, the nurse requested a non-urgent action by a clinician, or the nurse needed urgent action by the clinician within 24 hours. Second, when an issue was identified, we determined how often nurses needed to involve other healthcare professionals such as nonclinical health staff (e.g., social workers, case managers), clinicians, or pharmacists in order to resolve the issue.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Analysis

To compare baseline variables, we used the chi-square test for categorical variables. For continuous variables, we used the t-test for normally distributed measures and the Wilcoxon rank sum test for nonnormal measures. Because successful outreach was categorized hierarchically, we fit an ordered logistic regression to determine the association with LEP and successful outreach. We determined the association between LEP and each post-discharge issue by fitting a separate generalized estimating equation with a log link and Poisson distribution[12] for each patient-reported issue. For each model, patients were included if they responded to the question corresponding to the post-discharge issue (see **Appendix-2**). To determine the association between LEP and time to resolution of post-discharge issues, we fit a Cox proportional hazard model; this model was limited to patients who reported one or more issues. We verified the proportional hazards assumption by testing the interaction of LEP and time. All models were adjusted for the following confounders: age, race, ethnicity, marital status, insurance, discharging service, Elixhauser score, discharge with home services, and length of stay. We report the regression results as the predicted population rates and average marginal effects (AME) along with the 95% confidence intervals[13]. We completed analyses in SAS 9.4 (Cary, NC) and STATA 15.1 (College Station, TX). The UCSF Committee on Human Research approved this study. The code used to generate the cohort and perform the analyses can be found at https://github.com/sachinjshah.

Results

Participant Characteristics

During the one-year study period, 13,860 unique patients were discharged home from inpatient hospitalizations, and 1,566 (11%) had LEP (**Table 1**). The most common languages spoken by patients with LEP were Spanish (42%) and Cantonese (23%). Compared with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

English speakers, patients with LEP were more likely to be older (median 65y vs. 57y), Hispanic/Latinx (41% vs. 13%), and Asian (44% vs. 12%). Patients with LEP were more likely to be insured through Medicaid (37% vs. 21%) or Medicare (49% vs. 37%). Finally, patients with LEP were more likely to be discharged home with services (24% vs. 16%).

Limited English Proficiency and Patient Outreach

The care transition program reached a majority of discharged patients, although there were some differences by English proficiency (**Table 2**, unadjusted results **Appendix-3**). Fewer patients with LEP answered automated calls compared with patients with EP (average marginal effect [AME] -4.3%; 95% CI -1.9% to -6.7%). When patients did not answer the automated call, chart review identified that patients with LEP were more likely to have been contacted by a clinician or their staff (AME 0.9%; 95% CI 0.4% to 1.3%). When the care transition nurses called manually, they were statistically more likely to reach patients with LEP than those with EP, although the difference was not clinically significant. Overall, while most patients were reached by some method regardless of language status, patients with LEP were more likely not to be reached (AME 3.3%; 95% CI 1.4% to 5.1%).

Limited English Proficiency and Patient Outcomes

Patients with LEP were more likely to report a problem with all measured post-discharge issues (**Figure 1**, unadjusted results **Appendix-3**). A greater number of patients with LEP had questions regarding information in their discharge instructions compared to patients with EP (AME 4.8%; 95% CI, 2.7% to 6.9%). More patients with LEP needed help to get their prescriptions filled (AME 2.9%; 95% CI, 0.6% to 5.1%) and had concerns about their medications (AME 2.3%; 95% CI, 0.0% to 4.6%). After discharge, patients with LEP were more likely to have questions about follow up care (AME 2.8%; 95% CI, 0.3% to 5.3%). They were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

also more likely to have new or worsening symptoms (AME 3.2%; 95% CI, 0.7% to 5.8%), and other clinical questions for the nurses (AME 3.6%; 95% CI; 1.1% to 6.1%). Although patients with LEP faced more post-discharge issues, there was no significant difference in issue severity, as defined by the need for assistance after the phone call (**Appendix-4**). Furthermore, when patients reported an issue and the care transition nurse escalated the concern, nurses involved nonclinical health staff, clinicians, and pharmacists at similar rates (**Appendix-5**).

Among the 3,895 patients who reported at least one post-discharge issue, having LEP was associated with a longer time to issue resolution (adjusted HR 0.84, 95% CI 0.75 to 0.93) (**Figure 2,** unadjusted results **Appendix-3**). That is, at any time point, patients with LEP were 84% as likely as EP patients to have had their issue resolved. While this difference was statistically significant, it did not translate to a clinically meaningful difference (predicted time to resolution, median 3.3 days vs. 3.1 days, p=0.001).

Discussion

Overall, the care transitions program reached a substantial proportion of patients discharged from our adult hospital, including both English and non-English speaking patients. The program's robust efforts to reach patients with LEP, using multi-lingual automated scripts and prioritizing patients with LEP for manual outreach, enabled the program to reach a majority of patients with LEP. Despite these efforts, the program reached 3% fewer patients with LEP than those with EP.

Additionally, we found that limited English proficiency was strongly associated with higher rates of patient-reported, post-discharge issues. These associations were clinically significant and robust, persisting after accounting for confounders. Despite these disparities in reported post-discharge issues for patients with LEP, there were no differences in the urgency of reported issues or the need for assistance from other professionals. Additionally, the time needed to resolve patient-reported issues was similar for all patients.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The findings from this study confirm and expand on existing literature related to the communication barriers faced by hospitalized patients with LEP, which can manifest throughout the hospital course from admission to discharge. When patients with LEP are hospitalized, they receive adequate informed consent less than a third of the time, a statistic which is improved by easy access to professional interpreters.[14] When critically ill, patients with LEP and their families receive less information and emotional support from their healthcare providers.[15] During the hospital discharge process, few have a professional interpreter at the bedside to assist with discharge instructions,[6] so after hospital discharge, it may not be surprising that patients with LEP report all post-discharge issues at higher rates. This study finds discharge disparities in multiple domains, from understanding instructions to follow up appointments to symptoms. Structural barriers, both during the hospital course and the care transition period, may explain the disparities patients with LEP face in outcomes like readmission and mortality.[16,17]

Clinicians and health systems can take steps to improve the discharge experience for patients with LEP. First and foremost, clinicians must use a professional interpreter such as a telephone, video, or in-person interpreter to communicate discharge instructions effectively to patients with LEP.[18] Additionally, written translation technology can play an increasingly important role as technology improves. While the current implementation is imperfect, future iterations of artificial intelligence driven translation services may provide real-time, scalable text translation for written discharge instructions.[19] It will be important to ensure that these translations are accurate in order to avoid adverse events post-discharge. One emerging program, Meds-to-Beds, relies on pharmacists to deliver medications and medication education to patients in the hospital before discharge, utilizing professional interpreters when needed, and has been shown to reduce readmission rates.[20] Utilizing a program such as Meds-to-Beds along with appropriate written translations for patients to take home with them could lead to less miscommunication at the pharmacy when patients with LEP attempt to obtain their medications, a task often performed without an interpreter's help. Finally, post-discharge population health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

programs are commonly used to identify issues that may otherwise go unaddressed. These programs rely on automated phone calls and text messages to scale outreach. To promote equity, population health programs should support non-English languages and examine their data to ensure they are reaching patients with LEP as we have done with the program reported here. These methods of improving care for patients with LEP are established but require health system leadership and buy-in, including financial resources.

Addressing disparities for patients with LEP during care transitions will require health systems to assess the underlying causes of the disparities, including communication barriers, access to professional medical interpreters, and systemic bias. However, there are already several available interventions available that can improve outcomes for patients with LEP. The first step in understanding barriers is to have robust data collection, including the appropriate classification of patients by English proficiency.[21,22] Next, hospital systems must provide professional interpreters to all patients with LEP as mandated by the Civil Rights Act of 1964.[23,24] Professional interpreters improve patients' communication and understanding of their medical care.[14,25] However, the provision of interpreter services does not guarantee adequate use; studies have documented that even when interpreters are available, they may not be routinely used.[26] To assess interpreter use and support quality improvement programs to improve use, the electronic medical record must have a way for clinicians to easily document professional interpreter use during language discordant encounters.[21] This critical intervention is only effective if it is utilized.

This study has several limitations inherent to the data available and the nature of the care transitions outreach program. This study was conducted at an urban academic medical center with a substantive and linguistically diverse LEP population, and the findings may not generalize to other settings. There is the potential for unmeasured confounding to influence our observed relationship between LEP and post-discharge issues, although we accounted for demographic variables, insurance status, patient complexity, and clinical service. Our criteria for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

defining LEP favored specificity over sensitivity; as such, there may be a small group of patients in the EP cohort who required language assistance during their hospital stay. This tradeoff biases the measured disparities towards the null; that is, the true disparity may be more substantial than what is measured in this study.

In this study, we demonstrated that a care transitions outreach program that supports non-English languages can reach a majority of patients with LEP. We also showed the importance of such an outreach program for patients with LEP as they experienced substantially more post-discharge issues than English speakers across many domains. Future work should focus on implementing and refining known solutions that improve the quality of hospital discharges and care transitions for patients with limited English proficiency.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Acknowledgments

Contributors: LM and SJS were responsible for the study concept and design. SJS obtained funding and supervised the study. All authors were involved in the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of the data. SJS performed the statistical analyses. LM and SJS drafted the manuscript, and all authors critically revised it for important intellectual content. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. SJS had full access to all the data in the study and are the guarantors.

Funding: This study was supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (KL2TR001870), the UCSF Division of Hospital Medicine, and the UCSF Office of Population Health.

Sponsor's Role: The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author). LM, MG, LK, and SJS have nothing to disclose. KG reports that she was employed by the third party (CipherHealth) prior to her employment at UCSF and prior to any involvement with this study.

Ethical approval: The Human Research Protection Program Institutional Review Board at the University of California, San Francisco, approved this study (IRB# 19-27987).

Data sharing: Researchers can contact the corresponding author to access to the data. Code used to generate the cohort and perform the analyses can be found on github (https://github.com/sachinjshah).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Wilson E, Hm Chen A, Grumbach K, Wang F, Fernandez A. Effects of limited English proficiency and physician language on health care comprehension. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2005;20(9):800-806. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2005.0174.x

2. Karliner LS, Perez-Stable EJ, Gregorich SE. Convenient Access to Professional Interpreters in the Hospital Decreases Readmission Rates and Estimated Hospital Expenditures for Patients With Limited English Proficiency. *Med Care*. 2017;55(3):8.

3. Jacobs ZG, Prasad PA, Fang MC, Abe-Jones Y, Kangelaris KN. The Association between Limited English Proficiency and Sepsis Mortality. *J Hosp Med*. 2019;(2019-11-20 ONLINE FIRST). doi:10.12788/jhm.3334

4. Kripalani S, Jackson AT, Schnipper JL, Coleman EA. Promoting effective transitions of care at hospital discharge: A review of key issues for hospitalists. *J Hosp Med*. 2007;2(5):314-323. doi:10.1002/jhm.228

5. Krumholz HM. Post-Hospital Syndrome — An Acquired, Transient Condition of Generalized Risk. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(2):100-102. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1212324

6. Semere W, Nápoles AM, Gregorich S, Livaudais-Toman J, Karliner L. Caregiving for Older Adults with Limited English Proficiency: Transitioning from Hospital to Home. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2019;34(9):1744-1750. doi:10.1007/s11606-019-05119-y

7. Braun E, Baidusi A, Alroy G, Azzam ZS. Telephone follow-up improves patients satisfaction following hospital discharge. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2009;20(2):221-225. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2008.07.021

8. Phelan JC, Link BG, Tehranifar P. Social Conditions as Fundamental Causes of Health Inequalities: Theory, Evidence, and Policy Implications. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2010;51(1_suppl):S28-S40. doi:10.1177/0022146510383498

9. Chang VW, Lauderdale DS. Fundamental Cause Theory, Technological Innovation, and Health Disparities: The Case of Cholesterol in the Era of Statins. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2009;50(3):245-260. doi:10.1177/002214650905000301

10. Karliner LS, Auerbach A, Nápoles A, Schillinger D, Nickleach D, Pérez-Stable EJ. Language Barriers and Understanding of Hospital Discharge Instructions: *Med Care*. 2012;50(4):283-289. doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e318249c949

11. Elixhauser A, Steiner C, Harris DR, Coffey RM. Comorbidity Measures for Use with Administrative Data: *Med Care*. 1998;36(1):8-27. doi:10.1097/00005650-199801000-00004

12. Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data.pdf. Published online September 25, 2003.

13. Norton EC, Dowd BE, Maciejewski ML. Marginal Effects—Quantifying the Effect of Changes in Risk Factors in Logistic Regression Models. *JAMA*. 2019;321(13):1304-1305. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.1954

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

14. Lee JS, Pérez-Stable EJ, Gregorich SE, et al. Increased Access to Professional Interpreters in the Hospital Improves Informed Consent for Patients with Limited English Proficiency. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2017;32(8):863-870. doi:10.1007/s11606-017-3983-4

15. Thornton JD, Pham K, Engelberg RA, Jackson JC, Curtis JR. Families with limited English proficiency receive less information and support in interpreted intensive care unit family conferences*: *Crit Care Med*. 2009;37(1):89-95. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181926430

16. Narula N, Curran T, Nagle D. Return To The Hospital In Limited English Proficiency Patients After Inpatient Colorectal Surgery.

17. Karliner LS, Kim SE, Meltzer DO, Auerbach AD. Influence of language barriers on outcomes of hospital care for general medicine inpatients. *J Hosp Med*. 2010;5(5):276-282. doi:10.1002/jhm.658

18. Lee JS, Nápoles A, Mutha S, et al. Hospital discharge preparedness for patients with limited English proficiency: A mixed methods study of bedside interpreter-phones. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2018;101(1):25-32. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2017.07.026

19. Khoong EC, Steinbrook E, Brown C, Fernandez A. Assessing the Use of Google Translate for Spanish and Chinese Translations of Emergency Department Discharge Instructions. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2019;179(4):580. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.7653

20. Lash DB, Mack A, Jolliff J, Plunkett J, Joson JL. Meds-to-Beds: The impact of a bedside medication delivery program on 30-day readmissions. *J Am Coll Clin Pharm*. 2019;2(6):674-680. doi:10.1002/jac5.1108

21. Taira BR, Kim K, Mody N. Hospital and Health System–Level Interventions to Improve Care for Limited English Proficiency Patients: A Systematic Review. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*. 2019;45(6):446-458. doi:10.1016/j.jcjq.2019.02.005

22. Karliner LS, Napoles-Springer AM, Schillinger D, Bibbins-Domingo K, Pérez-Stable EJ. Identification of Limited English Proficient Patients in Clinical Care. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2008;23(10):1555-1560. doi:10.1007/s11606-008-0693-y

23. LEP.GOV -- Commonly Asked Questions and Answers Regarding Limited English Proficient (LEP) Individuals. (Accessed October 15, 2020). https://www.lep.gov/faq/faqs-rights-lep-individuals/commonly-asked-questions-and-answers-regarding-limited-english

24. Commonly Asked Questions and Answers Regarding the Protection of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Individuals under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title VI Regulations. https://www.lep.gov/sites/lep/files/resources/042511_Q%26A_TitleVI_and_Regulations.pdf

25. Karliner LS, Jacobs EA, Chen AH, Mutha S. Do Professional Interpreters Improve Clinical Care for Patients with Limited English Proficiency? A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Health Serv Res*. 2007;42(2):727-754. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00629.x

26. Tang AS, Kruger JF, Quan J, Fernandez A. From Admission to Discharge: Patterns of Interpreter Use among Resident Physicians Caring for Hospitalized Patients with Limited English Proficiency. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2014;25(4):1784-1798.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

doi:10.1353/hpu.2014.0160

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1: Patient characteristics of discharged patients by English proficiency

	Limited English proficiency (n=1566)	English proficient (n=12294)	p value
Age, median years [IQR]	65 [52, 77]	57 [42, 67]	<0.001
Male (%)	789 (50)	6467 (53)	0.098
Race (%)			<0.001
Asian	682 (44)	1444 (12)	
Black or African American	9 (1)	1145 (9)	
Other	640 (41)	2017 (16)	
White or Caucasian	235 (15)	7688 (63)	
Hispanic ethnicity (%)	635 (41)	1657 (13)	<0.001
Marital status (%)			<0.001
Divorced/Separate	105 (7)	979 (8)	
Married/Partnered	994 (63)	6593 (54)	
Single	253 (16)	4136 (34)	
Widowed	214 (14)	586 (5)	
Insurance status (%)			<0.001
Commercial	203 (13)	5133 (42)	
Medicaid	576 (37)	2535 (21)	
Medicare	763 (49)	4504 (37)	
Other	24 (2)	122 (1)	
Clinical service (%)			<0.001
General Surgery	175 (11)	1535 (12)	
Hospital Medicine	455 (29)	2597 (21)	
Neurosurgery	126 (8)	1628 (13)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Other	810 (52)	6534 (53)	
Length of stay (median [IQR])	3.2 [2.0, 5.8]	3.1 [1.5, 5.4]	<0.001
ICU stay (%)	196 (13)	1644 (13)	0.368
Elixhauser score (mean (SD))	2.0 (1.8)	2.3 (1.8)	<0.001
Discharge home with services (%)	372 (24)	1970 (16)	<0.001

Legend
IQR - interquartile range; ICU - intensive care unit

Of the 1,566 patients with LEP, the most common reported preferred languages were Spanish (42%) Cantonese (23%), Russian (8%), and Mandarin (7%). All other languages each made up less than 4% of discharges for patients with LEP. All of the patients with LEP self-identified as needing an interpreter.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2: Post-discharge program reach by English proficiency, adjusted probability and marginal effect

Patient outreach	Limited English proficiency, predicted probability	English proficient, predicted probability	Average marginal effect of limited English proficiency on outcome (95% CI)
Answered automated call	76.7%	81.0%	-4.3% (-1.9% to -6.7%)
Outreached completed by clinician	5.8%	4.9%	0.9% (0.4% to 1.3%)
Reached by manual RN call	1.4%	1.2%	0.2% (0.1% to 0.3%)
Not reached by any method	16.2%	12.9%	3.3% (1.4 to 5.1%)

Legend

Categories are mutually exclusive, hierarchical, and modeled using an ordered logistic model. Predicted probabilities from the adjusted model are presented. All models were adjusted for the following confounders: age, race, ethnicity, marital status, insurance, discharging service, Elixhauser score, discharge disposition, length of stay. Group p value <0.001. Unadjusted results can be found in Appendix 3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1: Patient-reported, post-discharge issues by English proficiency, adjusted



Legend
LEP - limited English proficiency, EP - English proficient

Predicted probabilities from the adjusted model are presented. Separate models were fit for each issue and included patients who answered the question: discharge instruction (n=10458), getting prescriptions (n=7849), medication concerns (n=10693), follow up questions (n=10554), new or worsening symptoms (n=11224), any other clinical issues (n=10170). Models were adjusted for the following confounders: age, race, ethnicity, marital status, insurance, discharging service, Elixhauser score, discharge disposition, length of stay.

Asterisk denotes that the difference between groups is statistically significant with $p < 0.05$. Discharge instruction difference 4.8% (95% CI, 2.7% to 6.9%) $p<0.001$; Getting prescriptions difference 2.9% (95% CI, 0.6% to 5.1%) $p=0.012$; Medications concerns difference 2.3% (95% CI, 0.0% to 4.6%) $p=0.0495$; Follow up questions difference 2.8% (95% CI, 0.3% to 5.3%) $p=0.027$; New or worsening symptoms difference 3.2% (95% CI, 0.7% to 5.8%) $p=0.012$; Any other clinical issues difference 3.6% (95% CI, 1.1% to 6.1%) $p=0.004$. Unadjusted results can be found in Appendix 3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2: Time to issue resolution after discharge by English proficiency, adjusted



Legend
LEP - limited English proficiency, EP - English proficient

Plot depicts the likelihood of a patient's reported issue being resolved at a given time post discharge by EP status. The likelihood is based on the Cox regression analysis and accounts for the following confounders: age, race, ethnicity, marital status, insurance, discharging service, Elixhauser score, discharge disposition, length of stay.

The adjusted hazard of an open issue for patients with LEP is 0.84 (95%CI 0.75 to 0.93) relative to patients with EP. That is, at any time point, patients with LEP at 84% as likely as EP patients to have had their issue resolved. Predicted time to resolution, median 3.3 days for LEP, 3.1 days for EP (p=0.001). Unadjusted results can be found in Appendix 3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix for "Disparities After Discharge. The Association of Limited English Proficiency and Post-Discharge Patient Reported Issues"

Lev Malevanchik, MD (1); Margaret Wheeler (2); Kristin Gagliardi (2); Leah Karliner, MD (3); Sachin J. Shah, MD, MPH (1)

1. Division of Hospital Medicine, University of California, San Francisco
2. Office of Population Health, UCSF Health
3. Multiethnic Health Equity Research Center, Division of General Internal Medicine, University of California, San Francisco

Table of contents

Appendix-1: Identification of Study Cohort 24

Appendix-2: The Automated Script 25

Appendix-3: Unadjusted versions of main manuscript results 27

3.1: Post-discharge program reach by English proficiency, unadjusted 27

3.2 Patient-reported, post-discharge issues by English proficiency 28

3.3 Time to issue resolution after discharge by English proficiency, unadjusted 29

Appendix-4: Problem urgency as documented 30

4.1 Problem urgency by English proficiency, unadjusted 30

4.2 Problem urgency by English proficiency, adjusted 30

Appendix-5: Issue Escalation and Involvement of Other Professionals 31

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix-1: Identification of Study Cohort



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix-2: The Automated Script

Please note, responses in red indicate that an alert will be sent to your follow-up staff.

Step 1: Language
Hi, this is Registered Nurse *Name of Nurse* from UCSF with an important follow-up call about your health, or the health of your family member.

- To continue in English, press 1 → Ok,thanks.
- To continue in Spanish, press 2 → Ok,thanks.
- Or to continue in Cantonese, press 3 → Ok,thanks.

Step 2: Who Answered:

- If you or your family member were recently discharged from UCSF Medical Center, please press 1 → Ok, thanks. Caregivers and parents, please complete this call on behalf of the patient.
- If you would like us to call you back later, press 2 → Ok, we'll call you back at a later time.
- Or if we have reached the wrong number, press 3 → Ok, we're sorry to have bothered you. Have a nice day.

Step 3: Symptoms
We want to know if you are doing well or if you need any help, so please answer all eight questions. If at any time you experience a medical emergency, please call 9-1-1 or go to the nearest emergency room.
Ok, let's get started!

- Are you having any new symptoms, or symptoms that are getting worse? Please press 1 for yes → Ok, we will call you back as soon as we can. If it's an emergency, call 9-1-1.
- Or press 2 for no → Ok, thanks.

Step 4: Prescriptions
Taking your medication correctly is important for your wellness and recovery.

- If you were prescribed new medicines when you left the hospital, press 1 → Proceed to Step 5.
- If you were not prescribed new medication when you left the hospital, press 2 → Ok, thanks.

Step 5: Prescriptions II (Only asked if they pressed 1 to Step 4)

- Do you need help getting your new medicines? Please press 1 for yes → Ok, we will call you back.
- Or press 2 for no → Ok, that's great to hear.

Step 6: Medications

- Do you have any medication questions or concerns? Please press 1 for yes → Ok, we'll call you back.
- Or press 2 for no → Ok, thanks.

Step 7: Follow-Up Help
Many patients are told to schedule or attend home visits or follow-up appointments after going home from the hospital.

- Do you have questions about your follow-up plan or need the phone number to schedule your appointment or home visit? Please press 1 for yes → Ok, we'll call you back.
- Or press 2 for no → Ok, thanks for letting us know.

Step 8: Discharge Instructions
When you left the hospital, you were given instructions on how to care for yourself at home.

- Do you have any questions about those instructions? Please press 1 for yes → Ok, we'll call you back.
- Press 2 for no → OK, great.

Step 9: Satisfaction
We strive to provide the best experience for our patients and families.
Were you satisfied with your stay at UCSF Medical Center?

- If you were completely satisfied, press 1 → Great, we're happy that you were very satisfied with your stay.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

• If you were somewhat satisfied, press 2 → OK, thanks for letting us know, we are sorry that we did not meet your expectations. • If you were not satisfied, press 3 → We're sorry to hear that we did not meet your expectations. If you would like to speak with our Patient Relations department regarding your experience, please call 415-353-1936.
Step 10: Other Clinical Issues One last question. Would you like the opportunity to discuss another clinical issue about your hospital stay with a UCSF nurse? • Please press 1 for yes → Ok, we'll call you back. • Press 2 for no → Ok, thanks.
Step 11: Goodbye Thank you for answering our questions. Have a nice day. Goodbye.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix-3: Unadjusted versions of main manuscript results

3.1: Post-discharge program reach by English proficiency, unadjusted

Unadjusted results that correspond to Table 2 in the main manuscript

	Limited English proficiency (n=1566)	**English proficient (n=12294)**
Answered automated call	76.2%	81.1%
Outreached completed by clinician	8.1%	4.6%
Reached by RN manual call	5.7%	0.7%
Not reached by any method	10.1%	13.7%

Legend

Raw column percentages presented. P value <0.001 (Fisher's exact test)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

3.2 Patient-reported, post-discharge issues by English proficiency

Adjusted and unadjusted results that correspond to Figure 1 in the main manuscript

Post-discharge issue	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Discharge instructions		
EP	6.4%	6.5%
LEP	13.5%	11.3%
Difference	7.2% (95% CI, 5.1 to 9.2%)	4.8% (95% CI, 2.7 to 6.9%)
Getting prescriptions		
EP	5.3%	5.5%
LEP	10.6%	8.3%
Difference	5.3% (95% CI, 3.1 to 7.6%)	2.9% (95% CI, 0.6 to 5.1%)
Medication concerns		
EP	10.5%	10.6%
LEP	13.9%	12.9%
Difference	3.4% (95% CI, 1.3 to 5.5%)	2.3% (95% CI, 0.0 to 4.6%)
Follow up questions		
EP	13.1%	13.3%
LEP	17.9%	16.1%
Difference	4.8% (95% CI, 2.5 to 7.2%)	2.8% (95% CI, 0.3 to 5.3%)
New or worsening symptoms		
EP	11.9%	11.9%
LEP	14.8%	15.1%
Difference	2.8% (95% CI, 0.8 to 4.9%)	3.2% (95% CI, 0.7 to 5.8%)
Any other clinical issues		
EP	12.6%	13.0%
LEP	20.4%	16.6%
Difference	7.8% (95% CI, 5.3 to 10.3%)	3.6% (95% CI, 1.1 to 6.1%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

3.3 Time to issue resolution after discharge by English proficiency, unadjusted

Unadjusted results that correspond to Figure 2 in the main manuscript



Legend
LEP - limited English proficiency, EP - English proficient

Plot depicts the likelihood of a patient's reported issue being resolved at a given time post discharge by EP status. The likelihood is based on the Cox regression analysis that does not account for any confounders.

The unadjusted hazard of an open issue for patients with LEP is 0.88 (95%CI 0.80 to 0.96) relative to patients with EP. As presented in the main manuscript, Figure 2, the adjusted hazard of an open issue for patients with LEP is 0.84 (95%CI 0.75 to 0.93) relative to patients with EP.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix-4: Problem urgency as documented

When a problem was identified care transition nurses would document the problem in a note in the EMR with a structured header that denoted the urgency of the problem as they understood it. These categories include: RN spoke with the patient, clinician notified, clinician action requested, clinician action needed, not reached. These categories are hierarchical and mutually exclusive.

4.1 Problem urgency by English proficiency, unadjusted

Problem urgency by RN note	**Limited English proficiency** (n=555)	**English proficient** (n=3340)
RN spoke with patient	11.5%	10.1%
Clinician notified	59.1%	55.2%
Clinician action requested	11.4%	15.4%
Clinician action needed	1.6%	1.6%
Not reached	16.4%	17.6%

Legend
Raw column percentages presented. P value 0.093 (Chi-square)

4.2 Problem urgency by English proficiency, adjusted

Problem urgency by RN note	**Limited English proficiency** (predicted probability)	**English proficient** (predicted probability)
RN spoke with patient	10.3%	10.3%
Clinician notified	55.8%	55.8%
Clinician action requested	14.8%	14.8%
Clinician action needed	1.6%	1.6%
Not reached	17.4%	17.4%

Legend
Predicted probabilities from the adjusted model are presented. Because of the hierarchical nature of the outcome, we used an ordered logit model. We adjusted for the following confounders: age, race, ethnicity, marital status, insurance, discharging service, Elixhauser score, discharge disposition, length of stay. Group p value =0.99.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix-5: Issue Escalation and Involvement of Other Professionals

	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Escalation to nonclinical health staff		
EP	2.5%	2.4%
LEP	1.6%	1.9%
Difference (LEP-EP)	-0.9% (-2.0 to 0.3%)	-0.6% (-2.1 to 0.9%)
Escalation to clinician		
EP	5.4%	5.1%
LEP	2.9%	4.2%
Difference (LEP-EP)	-2.5% (-4.1 to -0.9%)	-1.0% (-3.4 to 1.4%)
Escalation to pharmacist		
EP	7.7%	7.8%
LEP	6.3%	6.0%
Difference (LEP-EP)	-1.4% (-3.6 to 0.8%)	-1.8% (-4.2 to 0.6%)

Legend

LEP - limited English proficiency, EP - English proficient; Nonclinical health staff includes Health Care Navigator, Case Manager, Hospital Assistant, Medical Assistant, Social Worker

Predicted probabilities from the adjusted model are presented. Separate models were fit for each outcome and included patients who reported one or more issues (n=3895; LEP = 555, EP = 3340) . All models were adjusted for the following confounders: age, race, ethnicity, marital status, insurance, discharging service, Elixhauser score, discharge disposition, length of stay.

In the unadjusted analyses, escalation to clinician was statistically significant. However, no differences were statistically significant following adjustment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of ***cohort studies***

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(*a*) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (*b*) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	1 2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-5
Methods			
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	5
Participants	6	(*a*) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up (*b*) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	5
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	8, 12
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(*a*) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (*b*) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (*c*) Explain how missing data were addressed (*d*) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed (*e*) Describe any sensitivity analyses	7-8
Results			
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 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	8-9 App-I
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8-9

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251236; this version posted February 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	9-10
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 (*b*) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (*c*) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	9-10
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	10
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10
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	12-13
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	11-12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	12-13
Other information			
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	14

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

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 http://www.strobe-statement.org.