

Reviewer ID: John Zhu, Jeremy Mak, Risa Fox			
Type/Name of Outcome Measure: Canadian Occupational Performance Measure (COPM)			Total articles: 3
Author ID Year	Study Design	Setting	Population (sample size, age) and Group
Beradi et al. 2019	Cross-sectional	Rehabilitation service of the Paraplegic Center of Ostia, Italy	N=39 (71% male) Mean age: 53±15 years Time since injury: 15±14 years Neurological level of injury: C4-L3
Boswell-Ruys et al. 2010	Randomized, assessor-blinded trial	NSW, Australia	Individuals with SCI living in the community N=30, 25M 5F Mean age 45 yrs
Donnelly et al. 2004	Retrospective analysis	Tertiary Rehabilitation Centre, SCI unit, GF Strong Rehabilitation Centre, Vancouver, Canada	N=41 Demographic data available only for 38 of 41 29M, 9F 18 paraplegia, 20 tetraplegia 27 complete SCI, 11 incomplete 25 traumatic SCI, 13 nontraumatic Mean age 49(18.1), range 17-83 Mean time since SCI: 52(73.1) days, range 11-364
Samuelsson et al. 2004	Cross-sectional	Two spinal cord injury (SCI) centres in Sweden	N=56 (44M, 12F) Mean age 48.9 Mean time since SCI: 13.9 years
1. RELIABILITY			
Author ID	Internal Consistency	Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater	
Beradi et al. 2019	The COPM had a high degree of internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.93 for performance score and 0.89 for satisfaction score (T0).	The COPM a high ICC value, which indicates great test-retest reliability, after repeated measurements with a value of 0.99 for the performance and 0.98 for the satisfaction.	
2. VALIDITY			
Author ID	Validity		
Beradi et al. 2019	The COPM's construct validity with the SCIM III did not demonstrate a statistically significant correlation ($p < 0.05$), neither with the Pearson's correlation coefficient nor with the Spearman's Rho coefficient. Spearman's rho correlations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - COPM performance & SCIM: 0.30 - COPM satisfaction & SCIM: 0.17 Pearson's correlation coefficient correlations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - COPM performance & SCIM: 0.30 - COPM satisfaction & SCIM: 0.22 		
Donnelly et al. 2004	Portney and Watkins correlational descriptors btwn COPM & FIM Motor: (r-values) Admission: COPM Performance & FIM Motor: 0.452(P<0.001) COPM Satisfaction & FIM Motor: 0.514(P<0.001) Discharge: COPM Performance & FIM Motor: 0.388(P<0.05)		

	COPM Satisfaction & FIM Motor: 0.513(P<0.05) Change: COPM Performance & FIM Motor: 0.351(P<0.05) COPM Satisfaction & FIM Motor: 0.475(P<0.05)
Samuelson et al. 2004	Spearman's correlation btwn: COPM Performance & Klein-Bell ADL Scale: 0.07 (Not significant; p>0.05)
3. RESPONSIVENESS	
Author ID	Responsiveness
4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT	
Author ID	Floor/ceiling effect
5. INTERPRETABILITY	
Author ID	Interpretability
Boswell-Ruys et al. 2010	Minimally Worthwhile Treatment Effect: COPM Performance Component: 2.0 COPM Importance Component: 2.0 COPM Satisfaction Component: 2.0