The Effect of Bilingual Exposure on Language and Cognitive Development in Children Following Ischemic Stroke

Kai Ian Leung[1,2], Nomazulu Dlamini[3], Robyn Westmacott[4], & Monika Molnar[1,2]

[1]Department of Speech-Language Pathology, University of Toronto, Toronto, CANADA

[2]Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, CANADA

[3]Division of Neurology, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, CANADA

[4]Department of Psychology, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, CANADA

Author Note

This research was funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Grant (RGPIN-2019-06523) to M.M and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council - Alexander Graham Bell Canada Graduate Scholarship-Master's to K.I.L.

Correspondence to Kai Ian Leung (ORCID: 0000-0001-6331-5083) at Department of Speech-Language Pathology, University of Toronto, Room 1041-500 University Avenue, Toronto, ON, Canada M5G 1V7. E-mail: kaiian.leung@mail.utoronto.ca

Abstract

AIM

Many children who experience ischemic stroke come from bilingual backgrounds. Whether bilingual exposure affects post-stroke development is unclear. Our research evaluates the effects of bilingual vs. monolingual exposure on linguistic/cognitive development post-stroke.

METHOD

An institutional stroke registry and medical charts were used to gather clinical variable and outcome measure performance data on 237 children across 3 stroke-onset groups: neonatal - 0-28 days, first-year - >28 days to 12 months and childhood - 13 months to 18 years. We used the Pediatric Stroke Outcome Measure (PSOM) administered at several timepoints post-stroke, to evaluate cognitive and linguistic development.

RESULTS

While no main effect by language exposure group was found, bilingual children with stroke onset between 1 and 12 months of age, had better post-stroke performance on the language expression subscale, compared to monolinguals within 10 years after stroke onset.

INTERPRETATION

Overall, no clear advantages nor detrimental effects of bilingualism were found on children's post-stroke development of language and cognition. Our study suggests that a bilingual environment facilitates some aspects of language development – if the stroke occurs early in life.

WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS

- Bilingual exposure post-stroke in pediatric patients does not result in worse linguistic and/or cognitive development.

- Bilingual children with stroke onset between 1-12 months had better expressive language post-stroke.
- Bilingualism may be associated with protective factors when expressive language development is considered.

Keywords: pediatric stroke, bilingualism, development, language, cognition

List of Abbreviations:

AIS – Arterial Ischemic Stroke

PSOM – Pediatric Stroke Outcome Measure

The Effect of Bilingual Exposure on Language and Cognitive Development in Children Following Ischemic Stroke

Pediatric stroke is caused by a blockage or a rupture of the blood vessels of the brain and differs from adult stroke in clinical presentation, etiology, risk factors and outcomes (1). More than half of all strokes in children are arterial ischemic stroke (AIS), making up 70% of all ischemic strokes in children (1). AIS is due to an interruption of blood flow to the brain, in an arterial distribution secondary to occlusion of cerebral arteries (2). AIS most often presents as a focal neurologic deficit occurring in 61% of cases (3). There are important differences in etiology and outcome based on child's age at stroke onset, which is typically categorized into neonatal stroke (28 weeks' gestation to 28 postnatal days of life) or childhood stroke (infancy to 18 years of age) (4).

Cognitive and language development is often negatively affected by AIS. When most domains of language are considered (including phonology, semantics, syntax, discourse, literacy), children with strokes during the neonatal period up to 1st year of life have worse language outcomes compared to childhood stroke (5). Lesion laterality, or the affected hemisphere of the stroke, does not seem to affect language development after neonatal stroke (6), while in childhood stroke, it has been found to lead to language impairments after left hemisphere damage similarly to adults (7). Younger age at stroke (before 1st year) was also found to be a predictor of worse cognitive outcomes (8,9), particularly when response inhibition, divided attention, switching, sustained attention and other executive function evaluations are considered (10–12). Similar to language, the effect of lesion laterality on cognitive outcomes has proven inconsistent (11); risk factors for worse cognitive outcome

include larger lesion volume (10), infarcts affecting cortical and subcortical regions (8) and those involving both small and large vessel territories (13).

Research concerning the effects of specific demographic and psychosocial factors on cognitive and behavioral outcomes in pediatric stroke are emerging (14), however an unexplored area remains the socio-linguistic factor of bilingualism. Bilinguals, or those who are learning and using two or more languages, make up half of the world's population (15). While a prior belief was that learning two languages would have a negative impact on development, various recent research demonstrates that neurotypical monolingual and bilingual children reach the developmental milestones of language and cognitive development at the same pace (16). Moreover, it has been proposed that the bilingual environment might afford certain benefits cognitively and linguistically (17). According to the Bilingual Cognitive Advantage hypothesis, the mental exercise related to using two languages (e.g., activating the appropriate language, switching between languages, etc.) can positively affect other non-linguistic *cognitive* functions (18). Recent meta-analyses support the existence of a bilingual advantage in executive functions in neurotypical pediatric populations (19). In addition, childhood bilingualism is associated with *linguistic* advantages. Specifically, considering metalinguistic abilities, bilinguals tend to consistently outperform their monolingual peers (20).

The Current Study

Here, we investigate whether bilingual vs. monolingual exposure affects *language* or *cognitive* development differently in children following ischemic stroke. This is important, as speaking two languages at home and having low English-proficiency parents are associated with adverse child health outcomes (21); limited English-proficiency pediatric patients also experienced care-related disparities associated to their language use (22). Research concerning

bilingual exposure in pediatric stroke population and guidelines available to clinicians are scarce. Thus far, the only study that examined bilingual pediatric stroke populations did not include a control group of monolinguals (23). Therefore, to date, we are not aware of any studies evaluating bilingual exposure on stroke recovery in children.

The specific objective of this study is to determine if bilingual exposure affects cognitive and linguistic development in children following stroke as measured by the Pediatric Stroke Outcome Measure (PSOM). Currently, the PSOM is the only available standardized neurological examination of outcome, specific to pediatric stroke recovery (24). It is a composite outcome measure based on motor, language, and cognitive/behavioural dimensions, and has been utilized in various research (12,13,25). The PSOM scores analyzed in the current study were collected at hospital discharge and in the follow-up clinic, on average at 3-6 months and 12 months post-stroke, then at 1-2-year intervals after the first year up to 18 years of age. In our current sample, follow-up was at minimum 2 months post-stroke, up to a maximum 10.5-years post-stroke. This did not significantly differ between groups.

Given that bilingual exposure during childhood is not associated with any negative outcomes in terms of linguistic and cognitive development in neurotypical children, we hypothesized that bilingual exposure in pediatric stroke patients would not have any negative consequences. Accordingly, we predicted that the PSOM follow-up scores of bilingual children would not be worse than the scores of their monolingual peers. Further, considering the cognitive and linguistic advantages observed in bilinguals, bilingual patients would benefit from protective factors and show an advantage in their development, reflected through differences in performance in certain PSOM subscales (e.g., language and cognitive/behavioural). Finally, we predicted no differences between monolinguals and bilinguals if they suffered stroke within the

neonatal period. This is because post-stroke outcome measures show consistent decline across populations post neonatal stroke (9).

Method

Participants

Patients were enrolled in the Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids; Toronto, Canada) Stroke Registry between January 1, 2008 and December 1, 2019, and were considered for the study if they were first-ever arterial ischemic stroke (AIS) patients aged 0-17 years at stroke. Exclusion criteria included 1) presumed perinatal AIS; 2) multiple diagnoses of stroke (e.g., stroke recurrence or CSVT followed by AIS); 3) congenital/developmental disease or premorbid learning/psychological diagnosis prior to stroke onset, associated with language or cognitive outcomes (i.e., trisomy 21; nonverbal autism); 4) fewer than two PSOM evaluation scores available post-stroke. This study was approved by the Research Ethics Board at SickKids (REB#1000067719) and consent was provided for all participants or their caregivers as part of their enrollment in the SickKids Stroke Registry.

Outcome measure data was retrieved from the SickKids Stroke Registry. First and second language (other languages, if applicable) and described use or exposure were abstracted from medical charts. Our bilingual group was defined by concurrent learning of at least two languages (one heritage/home language and one societal language). Some children began to learn a second language in school settings - they were subsumed into the monolingual group as they came from a monolingual household, and cognitive and linguistic advantages are mostly associated with children who begun to learn two languages before school (26).

Previous literature using the PSOM indicated that emerging deficits were more common in recovery patterns of children younger than 1 year at stroke onset (13). Thus, patients were

stratified into three ‘age at stroke’ groups as follows: neonates – 0-28 days; first-year – >28 days to 12 months; and childhood – 13 months to 18 years. Using Kruskal-Wallis test, our preliminary analyses evaluating this grouping also corroborated these differences using the Pediatric Stroke Outcome Measure, $H(2)=12.15$, $p<.002$, indicating a significant difference between the three groups.

Pediatric Stroke Outcome Measure (PSOM)

The PSOM is a standardized, structured pediatric neurological examination comprised of five subscales; Right Sensorimotor, Left Sensorimotor, Language Expression and Language Reception and Cognitive/Behavioural subscales (24). Each PSOM subscale is scored on a range from 0 (no deficit), 0.5 (mild deficit), 1 (moderate deficit) to 2 (severe deficit), for a total of 10 considering all 5 subscales where a greater score is indicative of worse outcome. The PSOM considers the neurologist’s observations, parent’s report and information in charts (e.g., neuropsychological assessment). The PSOM’s validity and reliability have been established against standardized neuropsychological measures (24).

Statistical analysis

Anonymized data is available openly at https://dataverse.scholarsportal.info/dataverse/bilingualrecovery and was analyzed in Jamovi (version 1.6.6, The jamovi project, 2020, https://www.jamovi.org/). Growth curve modelling, a mixed effect model including timepoint (month at test from stroke onset) as a predictor, was used to analyse the relationship between language group and outcome (27,28). In our analyses, we focused on the Cognitive/Behavioural, Language Expression (i.e., language production) and Language Reception (i.e., comprehension of spoken language) PSOM subscales. A Combined Language subscale was calculated through sum of the scores from the language expression and

reception subscales. We fit linear mixed models for each PSOM subscale as outcome variables, using timepoint (month at test from stroke onset), language group (monolingual, bilingual), age at stroke onset (neonate, first-year, childhood), sex (female, male), laterality (right, left, bilateral) and its interaction as fixed effects (see Supplementary Materials for full models and Results related to sex and laterality, which are generally in line with findings reported in previous literature).

Here, we report models relevant to our hypothesis. These models include *timepoint* (month at test from stroke onset; each child was evaluated at multiple time points after stroke onset, up to 10 years), *language group* (monolingual vs. bilingual status), *age at stroke* (neonate, first-year, childhood) and its interactions. Timepoint variable was assigned a specified loading in the model, based on the month after stroke at test and was also used as random variable when fit improved. Maximum Likelihood method of estimation was used, and model fit was evaluated using Akaike Information Criterion and Bayesian Information Criterion values. Statistical analyses and reporting have been done in consultation with a University of Toronto statistician.

Results

Study Cohort

253 children with AIS met our inclusion and exclusion criteria. Of these patients, three patients were excluded due to chart unavailability; 13 deceased patients had residual data in the registry and were excluded. The final study sample totalled 237 children. The demographic and stroke characteristics of all children are available in Table 1. The sample consisted of monolingual patients (n=133; including 21 patients who learnt another language in a school setting), and bilingual patients (n=104). This distribution is in line with Statistics Canada's (2016) reports of 4 in 10 households speaking another language (29). While the language group

distribution is fairly comparable in the neonate and first-year age at stroke groups, the childhood group had more monolinguals than bilinguals. Also, the first-year group had the least number of patients (only 14%) compared to the other groups. Socioeconomic status (SES) was available for a subset of the sample and was evaluated by calculating a combined SES score based on annual income and the highest education of the parents. A Mann-Whitney test found no difference between monolinguals and bilinguals in socioeconomic status (U=782, p=0.59).

Cognitive/Behavioural PSOM

We modelled cognitive development as predicted by language group, age at stroke group and its interaction, with timepoint variable added in as a random slope to increase model fit. While language group was nonsignificant, age at stroke was a significant predictor of cognitive/behavioural PSOM scores, such that PSOM was seen to increase incrementally with an older age at stroke group indicating a worse outcome: the neonatal group had the lowest PSOMs, while the childhood group had highest PSOMs (Table 3).

Combined Language Subscales PSOM

We modelled language development as predicted by language group, age at stroke group and its interaction, with timepoint variable as additional fixed effect as it did not increase fit as random effect. Once again, language group was nonsignificant, though one of the age at stroke comparisons was significant and the interaction between the age at stroke group and language group showed a trend (p=.06; Table 3). Differing from the age at stroke group pattern apparent in the cognitive PSOM model, a U-shaped pattern with the highest scores was observed for first-year group, with a trend especially for monolinguals.

Language Reception PSOM

We modelled receptive language function as predicted by language group, age at stroke group and its interaction, with the timepoint variable as an fixed effect (as model fit did not increase as a random effect). Only age at stroke group was a significant predictor of language reception outcomes, such that the first-year group had worse outcomes compared to the other two groups (Table 3).

Language Expression PSOM

We modelled expressive language function as predicted by language group, age at stroke group and its interaction, with timepoint variable as additional fixed effect as it did not increase fit as random effect. As shown in Table 3, while language group was nonsignificant, age at stroke group was a significant predictor of cognitive/behavioural PSOM scores. Language group was nonsignificant, though age at stroke group and its interaction with language group were both predictors of language expression PSOM. Once again, the first-year group showed a significant difference between language groups such that monolinguals had worse language expression outcomes than bilinguals at age 28 days to 1 year at stroke onset (Figure 1).

Using growth curve modelling (Figure 2), we visualized trajectory differences for language expression PSOM scores over time by age at stroke onset groups. In Figure 2B, marked differences between the monolingual and bilingual trajectories particularly for the first-year group were evident. The monolingual group shows increases overtime if they had a stroke in their first-year, while the scores for bilingual group remained fairly steady over time.

Discussion

We evaluated the effects of bilingual exposure on the cognitive and linguistic development of children post-stroke, using the Pediatric Stroke Outcome Measure (PSOM) administered at several timepoints and up to 10.5 years post-stroke. First, we found no language group effect or interactions in the cognitive/behavioural PSOM model, suggesting that monolingual or bilingual status did not affect the cognitive/behavioral scores. Second, better outcomes for bilinguals in the group that suffered stroke between 1 and 12 months of age was found in the language expression PSOM model ($p=.02$), with a trend in the combined (expression and reception) language PSOM ($p=.06$).

Age at stroke onset was a predictor of stroke outcome, such that the first-year group had the highest scores in all PSOM subscales, consistent with previous findings (13). Similarly, Trauner and colleagues found the trajectory of language development in monolingual children after perinatal stroke is significantly altered between the 1st and 2nd year of life compared to controls, such that by 2 years of age, their stroke group experienced delays in language production (30). While this pertains to childhood stroke, it is possible that monolinguals of the first-year group showed similar outcomes for language expression, while the different outcome for bilinguals was reflective of the aforementioned linguistic advantage for bilinguals. We might also expect differences to be apparent if the stroke occurred outside of the neonatal period (28 days of birth), as this time frame would allow for sufficient bilingual exposure pre- and post-stroke. Outperforming monolinguals, bilingual children at this age make strides in language learning and metalinguistic skills (20). Alternatively, at follow-up PSOMs, the first-year group could also be showing evidence of their language development, as they transition from a primarily home environment to more societal exposure to the language of assessment (English).

Therefore, the difference in the language PSOM scores could equally be evidence of growth in English-language skills at this time in bilinguals (as the PSOM is in English), or evidence for a general advantage in language learning and metalinguistic skills in bilinguals in general which functions as a protective factor for pediatric patients.

The lack of an effect in the cognitive/behavioural model may suggest an issue with the sensitivity of the PSOM in detecting changes in cognition. Agreement between normal/abnormal PSOM subscale scores was the weakest for the cognitive/behavioural subscale, compared to other PSOM subscales (24). At this age, it is problematic to sharply distinguish cognition and language in these stroke-onset groups. Previous studies using the cognitive/behavioural PSOM have typically recruited older children aged 6 and onwards at study (10). In other atypically developing populations, evidence for a cognitive advantage in bilinguals has been mixed. There has been a documented bilingual cognitive advantage in inhibition and switching in pediatric traumatic brain injury (31) and in enhancing executive functioning on working memory tasks, but not mental flexibility and verbal fluency in children with epilepsy (32).

The timing of pediatric stroke during development entails complex cognitive and linguistic challenges in recovery (9). Vulnerability during “sensitive periods” of development leave children open to the risk of further disruption in development, building on previous milestones (5). Recovery has been conceptualized as categorical change on the PSOM severity classification system over time (13,25); as assessed in the Recurrence and Recovery Questionnaire (based on the PSOM) (33); and more generally, through a restoration/restitution of function or an adaptative compensation through substitution (34). *Recovery* as it relates to post-stroke outcomes is predominantly used in the literature, though *development* is an intrinsically

related concept. As such, conflation of these terms further complicate the situation of atypically-developing populations (34).

This is the first study evaluating the effect of bilingualism on language and cognitive development post-stroke. Our overall results indicate that patients from monolingual and bilingual environments follow similar development post-stroke when their cognitive and linguistic abilities are considered. However, bilinguals aged 1-12 months at stroke onset had better outcomes for expressive language, than monolinguals at the same age. Considering the various limitations of the current study, more data is needed to make a more definitive conclusion about the cognitive and linguistic recovery of monolingual and bilingual patients. Importantly, the current study did not find any negative effects of bilingual exposure on development in children post-stroke.

References

1. Tsze DS, Valente JH. Pediatric stroke: a review. Emergency Medicine International. 2011;2011.
2. Bernard TJ, Goldenberg NA. Pediatric arterial ischemic stroke. Hematology/oncology clinics of North America. 2010;24(1):167–80.
3. DeVeber GA, Kirton A, Booth FA, Yager JY, Wirrell EC, Wood E, et al. Epidemiology and outcomes of arterial ischemic stroke in children: the Canadian Pediatric Ischemic Stroke Registry. Pediatric neurology. 2017;69:58–70.
4. Fuentes A, Deotto A, Desrocher M, deVeber G, Westmacott R. Determinants of cognitive outcomes of perinatal and childhood stroke: A review. Child Neuropsychology. 2016;22(1):1–38.
5. Max JE, Bruce M, Keatley E, Delis D. Pediatric stroke: plasticity, vulnerability, and age of lesion onset. The Journal of neuropsychiatry and clinical neurosciences. 2010;22(1):30–9.
6. Chabrier S, Peyric E, Drutel L, Deron J, Kossorotoff M, Dinomais M, et al. Multimodal outcome at 7 years of age after neonatal arterial ischemic stroke. The Journal of pediatrics. 2016;172:156–61.
7. Gout A, Seibel N, Rouvière C, Husson B, Hermans B, Laporte N, et al. Aphasia owing to subcortical brain infarcts in childhood. Journal of child neurology. 2005;20(12):1003–8.
8. Studer M, Boltshauser E, Mori AC, Datta A, Fluss J, Mercati D, et al. Factors affecting cognitive outcome in early pediatric stroke. Neurology. 2014;82(9):784–92.

9. Westmacott R, Askalan R, Macgregor D, Anderson P, Deveber G. Cognitive outcome following unilateral arterial ischaemic stroke in childhood: effects of age at stroke and lesion location. Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology. 2010;52(4):386–93.

10. Hajek CA, Yeates KO, Anderson V, Mackay M, Greenham M, Gomes A, et al. Cognitive outcomes following arterial ischemic stroke in infants and children. Journal of Child Neurology. 2014;29(7):887–94.

11. O'Keeffe F, Liégeois F, Eve M, Ganesan V, King J, Murphy T. Neuropsychological and neurobehavioral outcome following childhood arterial ischemic stroke: attention deficits, emotional dysregulation, and executive dysfunction. Child Neuropsychology. 2014;20(5):557–82.

12. Westmacott R, McDonald KP, Roberts SD, deVeber G, MacGregor D, Moharir M, et al. Predictors of cognitive and academic outcome following childhood subcortical stroke. Developmental neuropsychology. 2018;43(8):708–28.

13. Felling RJ, Rafay MF, Bernard TJ, Carpenter JL, Dlamini N, Hassanein SMA, et al. Predicting recovery and outcome after pediatric stroke: results from the International Pediatric Stroke Study. Annals of neurology. 2020;87(6):840–52.

14. Durber CM, Yeates KO, Taylor HG, Walz NC, Stancin T, Wade SL. The family environment predicts long-term academic achievement and classroom behavior following traumatic brain injury in early childhood. Neuropsychology. 2017;31(5):499.

15. Grosjean F. Bilingual. Harvard university press; 2010.

16. Werker JF, Byers-Heinlein K, Fennell CT. Bilingual beginnings to learning words. Vol. 364, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2009.

17. Bialystok E, Werker JF. The systematic effects of bilingualism on children's development. Developmental science. 2017;20(1).

18. Bialystok E, Craik F, Luk G. Cognitive control and lexical access in younger and older bilinguals. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, memory, and cognition. 2008;34(4):859.

19. Gunnerud HL, ten Braak D, Reikerås EKL, Donolato E, Melby-Lervåg M. Is bilingualism related to a cognitive advantage in children? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin. 2020;146(12):1059.

20. Galambos SJ, Goldin-Meadow S. The effects of learning two languages on levels of metalinguistic awareness. Cognition. 1990;34(1):1–56.

21. Eneriz-Wiemer M, Sanders LM, Barr DA, Mendoza FS. Parental limited English proficiency and health outcomes for children with special health care needs: a systematic review. Academic pediatrics. 2014;14(2):128–36.

22. Chan KS, Keeler E, Schonlau M, Rosen M, Mangione-Smith R. How do ethnicity and primary language spoken at home affect management practices and outcomes in children and adolescents with asthma? Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine. 2005;159(3):283–9.

23. François C, Ripollés P, Ferreri L, Muchart J, Sierpowska J, Fons C, et al. Right structural and functional reorganization in four-year-old children with perinatal arterial ischemic stroke predict language production. Eneuro. 2019;6(4).

24. Kitchen L, Westmacott R, Friefeld S, MacGregor D, Curtis R, Allen A, et al. The pediatric stroke outcome measure: a validation and reliability study. Stroke. 2012;43(6):1602–8.

25. Slim M, Fox CK, Friefeld S, Dlamini N, Westmacott R, Moharir M, et al. Validation of the pediatric stroke outcome measure for classifying overall neurological deficit. Pediatric research. 2020;88(2):234–42.

26. Birdsong D. Plasticity, variability and age in second language acquisition and bilingualism. Frontiers in psychology. 2018;9:81.

27. Tilling K, Sterne JAC, Rudd AG, Glass TA, Wityk RJ, Wolfe CDA. A new method for predicting recovery after stroke. Stroke. 2001;32(12):2867–73.

28. Wilson SM, Eriksson DK, Brandt TH, Schneck SM, Lucanie JM, Burchfield AS, et al. Patterns of recovery from aphasia in the first 2 weeks after stroke. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research. 2019;62(3):723–32.

29. Statistics Canada. Language spoken most often at home by other language(s) spoken regularly at home and age. . Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-402-X2016005. 2017.

30. Trauner DA, Eshagh K, Ballantyne AO, Bates E. Early language development after peri-natal stroke. Brain and language. 2013;127(3):399–403.

31. Gonzalez I. Executive Functioning Performance of Bilingual and Monolingual Children with a Traumatic Brain Injury. Carlos Albizu University; 2018.

32. Veenstra AL, Riley JD, Barrett LE, Muhonen MG, Zupanc M, Romain JE, et al. The impact of bilingualism on working memory in pediatric epilepsy. Epilepsy & Behavior. 2016;55:6–10.

33. Lo W, Gordon AL, Hajek C, Gomes A, Greenham M, Anderson V, et al. Pediatric stroke outcome measure: predictor of multiple impairments in childhood stroke. Journal of child neurology. 2014;29(11):1524–30.

34. Malone LA, Felling RJ. Pediatric stroke: unique implications of the immature brain on injury and recovery. Pediatric neurology. 2020;102:3–9.

Table 1. Patient demographics (sex, age at stroke group subdivided into 3 groups based on literature and preliminary analyses, socioeconomic status) and stroke characteristics (lesion laterality) for monolingual and bilingual participants

	All Children (n=237)	Monolingual (n=133)	Bilingual (n=104)
Sex, n (%)			
Male	153 (65%)	89 (58%)	64 (42%)
Female	84 (35%)	44 (52%)	40 (48%)
Age at Stroke, n (%)			
Neonatal (<28 days of life)	105 (44%)	53 (50%)	52 (49%)
First-Year (28+ days – 12 months)	33 (14%)	18 (55%)	15 (45%)
Childhood (13 months – 18 years)	99 (42%)	62 (63%)	37 (37%)
Stroke laterality, n (%)			
Left-sided	89 (38%)	46 (52%)	43 (48%)
Right-sided	55 (23%)	32 (58%)	23 (42%)
Bilateral	68 (29%)	40 (59%)	28 (41%)
Unknown/NA	25 (10%)	14 (56%)	11 (44%)
*Composite Socioeconomic Status, M(SD)**	3.40 (0.87)	3.45 (0.86)	3.31 (0.91)

*Only available for a subset of patients with SES information available (n=81)

Figure 1. Plot of language expression PSOM by age at stroke group and language group over multiple assessments post-stroke within a 10-year period. A higher PSOM scores is indicative of a worse outcome. Note that the PSOM subscales are rated in a scale from 0-2, this data is scaled to 0.5.



Figure 2. (A) Growth curves for language expression PSOM trajectories over time by age at stroke onset; (B) Growth curves for language expression PSOM trajectories over time by age at stroke onset for monolingual and bilinguals independently. The grey overlay indicates standard error. A higher PSOM score equates to a worse outcome. Note that the PSOM subscales are rated in a scale from 0-2.



Table 2. Summary of results from growth curve models predicting the fixed effects of timepoint, language group, age at stroke group and its interaction on various PSOM subscales, significant values are bolded. For full models, see supplementary materials.

Independent	Predictor - Effect	Estimate	SE	95% CI	t-value	*p*	
Cognitive/ behavioural PSOM	(Intercept)	0.310	0.034	0.242-0.378	8.89	<.001	
	Timepoint	**0.003**	**7.09e-4**	**0.001-0.004**	**4.76**	**<.001**	*******
	Language group	-0.054	0.052	-0.157-0.048	-1.03	0.30	
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate)	**0.233**	**0.094**	**0.048-0.417**	**2.47**	**0.01**	*****
	Age at stroke group (childhood - neonate)	**0.320**	**0.066**	**0.189-0.451**	**4.79**	**<.001**	*******
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate) ⊠ Language group	-0.110	0.139	-0.383-0.163	-0.78	0.43	
	Age at stroke group (childhood - neonate) ⊠ Language group	-0.003	0.101	-0.201-0.195	-0.03	0.97	
Combined Language PSOM	(Intercept)	0.354	0.044	0.268-0.441	8.04	<.001	
	Timepoint	3.24e-4	8.64e-4	-0.001-0.002	0.37	0.70	
	Language group	-0.097	0.088	-0.270-0.075	-1.10	0.27	
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate)	**0.292**	**0.117**	**0.062-0.521**	**2.49**	**0.01**	*****
	Age at stroke group (childhood-neonate)	0.114	0.084	-0.050-0.280	1.35	0.17	

Independent	Predictor - Effect	Estimate	SE	95% CI	t-value	*p*	
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate) ⊠ Language group	-0.435	0.234	-0.895-0.023	-1.85	0.06	
	Age at stroke group (childhood-neonate) ⊠ Language group	0.022	0.169	-0.309-0.353	0.13	0.89	
Language Expression PSOM	(Intercept)	0.226	0.026	0.174-0.278	8.60	<.001	
	Timepoint	1.72e-4	5.21e-4	-8.49e-4-0.001	0.33	0.74	
	Language group	-0.072	0.052	-0.175-0.031	-1.37	0.17	
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate)	**0.160**	**0.070**	**0.023-0.297**	**2.28**	**0.02**	*****
	Age at stroke group (childhood- neonate)	0.046	0.502	-0.051-0.145	0.93	0.35	
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate) ⊠ Language group	**-0.326**	**0.140**	**-0.600-0.052**	**-2.33**	**0.02**	*****
	Age at stroke group (childhood- neonate) ⊠ Language group	0.017	0.100	-0.179-0.214	0.17	0.86	
Language Reception PSOM	(Intercept)	0.132	0.020	0.092-0.172	6.49	<.001	
	Timepoint	2.21e-4	4.29e-4	-6.19e-4-0.001	0.51	0.60	
	Language group	-0.032	0.040	-0.112-0.048	-0.78	0.43	
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate)	**0.141**	**0.054**	**0.034-0.247**	**2.60**	**0.01**	*****
	Age at stroke group (childhood- neonate)	0.060	0.039	-0.016-0.137	1.55	0.12	

Independent	Predictor - Effect	Estimate	SE	95% CI	t-value	*p*
	Age at stroke group (first-year - neonate) ⊠ Language group	-0.128	0.108	-0.341-0.084	-1.18	0.23
	Age at stroke group (childhood- neonate) ⊠ Language group	-0.009	0.07	-0.163-0.144	-0.12	0.90