## **APPENDIX:**

## **Table A1:** Sensitivity test: Rates of new clients receiving two, three orfour medication follow-up visits within 30, 60 or 90 days and apreceding "clean period" of 90 days

	Two medication	Three medication	Four medication
	TOHOW-UP VISIUS	TOHOW-UP VISIUS	ionow-up visits
30 days			
English	9.50	3.99	1.97
Spanish	9.76	3.60	1.54
60 days			
English	20.58	10.20	5.73
Spanish	23.44*	10.55	5.66
90 days			
English	29.58	17.10	10.37
Spanish	34.46*	19.23*	11.35

Note: N=911. \*Indicates that the mean rate of persons meeting adequate follow-up visits differed by primary language at statistically significant levels (p<0.05).

Table A2: Sensitivity test: Rates of new clients receiving two, three or
four medication follow-up visits within 60, 90, or 180 days and a
preceding "clean period" of 180 days

<u></u>	-			
	Two medication follow-up visits	Three medication follow-up visits	Four medication follow-up visits	
60 days				
English	22.94	12.08	7.13	
Spanish	25.26	12.81	6.36	
90 days				
English	31.13	19.24	12.13	
Spanish	34.97*	21.90*	13.29	
180 days				
English	44.01	33.71	25.96	
Spanish	50.02*	39.93*	31.40*	
Nets N 740 * Indiants that the mean metal of means we atting				

Note: N=718. \* Indicates that the mean rate of persons meeting adequate follow-up visits differed by primary language at statistically significant levels (p<0.05).

**Table A3:** Sensitivity test: Association between time and language programming with rates of new clients receiving two, three or four medication follow-up visits within 30, 60 or 90 days and a preceding "clean period" of 90 days

Regression variable	Two medication follow- up visits	Three medication follow- up visits	Four medication follow-up visits
30 davs	•		
Quarter	-0.209 [-0.604,0.186]	-0.175 [-0.302,-0.049]**	-0.067 [-0.142,0.009]
Language programming	2.181 [-6.743,11.106]	-1.133 [-5.986,3.720]	0.253 [-3.200,3.706]
Quarter * programming	-0.123 [-0.544,0.299]	0.030 [-0.166,0.226]	-0.014 [-0.135,0.106]
60 days			
Quarter	-0.104 [-0.508,0.301]	-0.164 [-0.409,0.081]	-0.168 [-0.299,-0.036]*
Language programming	4.073 [-4.617,12.763]	1.618 [-5.930,9.165]	4.342 [-1.613,10.297]
Quarter * programming	-0.398 [-0.810,0.014]	-0.182 [-0.499,0.134]	-0.204 [-0.427,0.018]
90 days			
Quarter	-0.282 [-0.916,0.352]	-0.218 [-0.513,0.077]	-0.205 [-0.388,-0.023]*
Language programming	3.163 [-8.098,14.424]	1.419 [-8.340,11.178]	2.400 [-5.856,10.656]
Quarter * programming	-0.288 [-0.926,0.351]	-0.193 [-0.550,0.163]	-0.197 [-0.508,0.113]

**Note:** This table shows partial results from nine regression models, each having a dependent variable constructed slightly differently, by follow-up time and number of required visits. All control variables were included in each model. The dependent variable ultimately selected for the final analysis is indicated in bold. N=911. \*Indicates \*P < 0.05; \*\*P < 0.01.

**Table A4:** Sensitivity test: Association between time and language programming with rates of new clients receiving two, three or four medication follow-up visits within 60, 90, or 180 days and a preceding "clean period" of 180 days

Regression variable	Two medication follow- up visits	Three medication follow- up visits	Four medication follow-up visits
60 days			
Quarter	-0.608 [-1.225,0.009]	-0.450 [-0.922,0.022]	-0.300 [-0.605,0.005]
Language programming	-1.939 [-16.239,12.361]	-7.389 [-22.984,8.207]	-1.185 [-10.938,8.569]
Quarter * programming	0.022 [-0.629,0.672]	0.153 [-0.374,0.681]	0.066 [-0.274,0.406]
90 days			
Quarter	-0.696 [-1.321,-0.072]*	-0.777 [-1.420,-0.133]*	-0.531 [-0.973,-0.089]*
Language programming	-0.112 [-14.600,14.376]	-7.984 [-26.222,10.255]	-8.040 [-21.942,5.861]
Quarter * programming	0.078 [-0.612,0.768]	0.318 [-0.381,1.017]	0.221 [-0.266,0.709]
180 days			
Quarter	-0.393 [-1.000,0.213]	-0.672 [-1.294,-0.051]*	-0.646 [-1.196,-0.096]*
Language programming	8.949 [-4.421,22.319]	2.931 [-12.068,17.929]	-1.537 [-17.602,14.528]
Quarter * programming	-0.230 [-0.893,0.432]	-0.032 [-0.715,0.652]	0.023 [-0.644,0.690]

**Note:** This table shows partial results from nine regression models, each having a dependent variable constructed slightly differently, by follow-up time and number of required visits. All control variables were included in each model. N=718. \*Indicates \*P < 0.05; \*\*P < 0.01.