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**Type of Outcome Measure:** Sickness Impact Profile 68 (SIP68)  
**Total articles:** 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID Year</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Population (sample size, age) and Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Post et al. 2001 | Cross-sectional, using a combination of 3 samples | Research lab | N=111 wheelchair-using people (55=SCI and 56=other)  
Athletes = 49 (SCI = 23, other = 26)  
SCI = 32  
Rheumatic disease = 30  
Mean age=athletes 36.5, SCI 38.2, Rheumatic disease 69.9 |
| Post 1998B (Predictors of Health Status...) | Cross-sectional study | Community in Netherlands | 318 SCI patients; avg. age=39.4; 75% men |
| Post et al. 1996 | Cross-sectional, oral interviews | Patient’s homes | N=315; 75% male, avg. age = 39.4  
SCI injury patients between ages 18-65  
Complete tetraplegia: 21.7%  
Complete paraplegia: 29.2%  
Incomplete tetraplegia: 20.4%  
Incomplete paraplegia: 28.6%  
Mean time since injury = 3.6 years, SD 1.9 |

### 1. RELIABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
<th>Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post et al. 2001</td>
<td>α = 0.88</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Post et al. 1996 | Cronbach’s alpha = 0.92  
5 out of 6 subscales have good internal consistency 0.72-0.91;  
The subscale “emotional stability” was the only to lag behind (0.68); but still has ‘moderately good’ internal consistency. | No data available |

### 2. VALIDITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID</th>
<th>Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Post et al. 2001 | Authors expected moderate to strong correlations between scales of the Nottingham Health Profile (NHP) and the SIP68 with criterion variables, with comparable correlations between scales of each questionnaire that are considered to measure the same aspects of health and the criterion variables.  
Scales of NHP & SIP68 with Spearman ρ correlations >0.30 (all P<0.01):  
NHP SA w/ SIP68 Physical Mobility: ρ=0.68  
NHP ES w/ SIP68 Emotional reactions: ρ=0.56  
NHP SB w/ SIP68 Emotional reactions: ρ = 0.41  
NHP PAC w/ SIP68 Emotional reactions: ρ=0.43  
NHP ES w/ SIP68 Social isolation: ρ=0.41  
NHP SB w/ SIP68 Social isolation: ρ=0.35  
NHP PAC w/ SIP68 Social isolation: ρ=0.43  
NHP ES w/ SIP68 Pain: ρ=0.36 |
NHP SB w/ SIP68 Pain: $\rho = 0.54$
NHP MR w/ SIP68 Pain: $\rho = 0.38$
NHP PAC w/ SIP68 Pain: $\rho = 0.35$
NHP ES w/ SIP68 Energy: $\rho = 0.46$
NHP SB w/ SIP68 Energy: $\rho = 0.58$
NHP MR w/ SIP68 Energy: $\rho = 0.46$
NHP PAC w/ SIP68 Energy: $\rho = 0.43$
NHP SB w/ SIP68 Sleep: $\rho = 0.37$

Abbreviations:
SA = Somatic Autonomy
MC = Motor Control
ES = Emotional Stability
SB = Social Behaviour
MR = Mobility Range
PAC = Psychological Autonomy and Communication

SIP scales & Upper extremity function $\rho = 0.13$-$0.58$
SIP scales & Lower extremity function $\rho = -0.07$ to $-0.33$
SIP scales & Perceived health $\rho = -0.02$-$0.24$
SIP scales & Social warning $\rho = 0.09$-$0.62$
SIP scales & Well-being $\rho = 0.08$-$0.53$

Post et al. 1998B
Social functioning (path coefficient* = -0.48), marital status (-0.38), psychological functioning (-0.19), and age (-0.16) were significant predictors of life satisfaction (total $R^2 = 0.44$). Authors did not mention if the above negative correlations were expected.
*Path coefficient in multiple regression are comparable to beta values, as calculated by LISREL statistical program

Post et al. 1996
Spearman correlations:
Inter-correlation between $\rho = 0.08$-$0.67$ on subscales. All correlations are low, except for correlation of "mobility range" with "social behavior" ($\rho = 0.67$). Correlations $\rho > 0.20$ (19) have $P < 0.001$.
Barthel Index and SIP 68, $\rho = -0.74$, $P < 0.001$
Life Satisfaction Questionnaire (LSQ or LISAT-9) and SIP-68, $\rho = -0.52$, $P < 0.001$
On Catell’s salient similarity index, comparing proposed factor structure to obtained factor structure for all subscales, s values ranged from 0.37-0.95, showing good similarity.

3. RESPONSIVENESS – No data available

4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT – No data available

5. INTERPRETABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID</th>
<th>Interpretability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post et al. 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Mean (SD) score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic autonomy</td>
<td>5.8 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility control</td>
<td>7.4 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility range</td>
<td>2.4 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social behavior</td>
<td>5.1 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>1.0 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychic autonomy &amp; communication</td>
<td>1.1 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SIP68</td>
<td>22.8 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>