

Supplementary material to article by B. Brouns et al. "Effect of a comprehensive eRehabilitation intervention alongside conventional stroke rehabilitation on disability and health-related quality of life: a pre-post comparison"

Table SII. Comparison between intention-to-treat (ITT) and per-protocol (PP) analyses. Mean change scores for control group (CG, $n = 153$), complete intervention group (IG total, $n = 164$) and users (IG users, $n = 53$) and mean differences in change scores between ITT and PP

	T0-T3				T3-T6			
	ΔCG	ΔIG Total	ΔIG Users	Difference total-users	ΔCG	ΔIG Total	ΔIG User	Difference total-users
SIS (0-100, high - low impact)								
Communication	3.5	2.5	0.6	-1.9	-1.7	-0.3	2.6	2.9
Memory	4.5	3.6	3.7	0.1	-1.3	2.1	4.2	2.1
Mobility	12.2	9.4	11.4	2.0	-0.8	1.1	1.7	0.6
Feelings & emotion	0.6	-1.2	1.1	2.3	0.5	0.4	-0.3	-0.7
Activity of daily living	9.6	8.8	11.4	2.6	0.2	0.7	3.1	2.4
Physical strength	15.3	9.3	10.6	1.3	-5.7	3.3	6	2.7
Meaningful activities	-	-	-	-	1.6	9.1	16.2	7.1
EQ5D (0-1, low-high HRQoL)	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.0	-0.01	0.01	0.0	-0.01
FSS (0-7, low-high fatigue)	-0.1	0.3	0.0	-0.3	0.2	-0.2	-0.3	0.01
PAM-13 (0-100, low-high self-management)	3.2	0.8	-1.6	-2.4	2.2	1.3	3.6	2.0
SF-12 (0-100, low-high HRQoL)								
Physical	-	-	-	-	1.1	1.1	4.1	3.0
Mental	-	-	-	-	0.6	1.7	-0.2	-1.9
USER-P (0-100, low-high participation)								
Frequency	-5.5	-6.6	-6.0	-0.6	-4.4	1.9	-4.3	-6.2
Restriction	-	-	-	-	6.4	5.4	8.2	2.8
Satisfaction	-	-	-	-	3.6	5.5	8.9	3.4
IPAQ-SF (min physical activity)	154	102	270	168	2.8	60.0	141	81

Numbers in bold; differ significantly from control group ($p < 0.05$). HRQoL: health-related quality of life.