Supplement 2. Results from the survey evaluating the implementation process and adherence to the evidence-based guidelines for upper extremity assessment after stroke. The survey was answered by 44 clinicians (21 OT and 23 PT, response rate 98%) working with stroke rehabilitation at Sahlgrenska University Hospital.

### Implementation process

**How has it worked with information that has been offered regarding…?**

- **… guideline as whole**
- **… outcome measures**
- **… practical workshops**
- **… interpretation**

**How has it worked with the structure of the implementation work regarding…?**

- **… clinical facilitators**
- **… taking part of information**
- **… learning the new instruments**
- **… learning to use SAFE**
- **… learning to use ARAT-2**
- **… learning to use FMA-UE**

**How has it worked to follow the routine in terms of …?**

- **… using the SAFE**
- **… using the ARAT-2**
- **… using the FMA-Arm**
- **… the specific time points**
- **… interpreting the results**
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### Outcome measures

#### How many assessments have you performed with...?

- **SAFE**
- **ARAT-2**
- **FMA-UE**

#### After you started using the new instrument, after how many patients did you feel comfortable?

- **SAFE**
- **ARAT-2**
- **FMA-UE**

#### How long time on average does it take to perform an assessment with...?

- **SAFE**
- **ARAT-2**
- **FMA-UE**

### Overall outcome/benefit

#### The stroke guidelines for upper extremity assessment have ....

- ... increased my focus on assessment
- ... increased my knowledge
- ... provided a better structure
- ... provided a better tool for prognosis
- ... not affected the time I spend on treatment

---

**Note**: The diagrams illustrate the distribution of responses for each question, with color coding indicating the percentage of respondents in different categories.