

Reviewer ID: Christie Chan, John Zhu, Matthew Querée, Joanne Chi

Type of Outcome Measure: Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)

Total articles: 9

Author ID Year	Study Design	Setting	Population (sample size, age) and Group
Dijkers 1999	Survey; follow-up study	National SCI database	<p>N=2183 (1766M, 417F) # participants in each age range: 0-19: N=412 20-29: N=802 30-39: N=444 40-49: N=268 50-59: N=142 >60: N=115</p> <p>Records from the National SCI database, containing entries since 1973.</p>
Geyh et al. 2010	Cross-sectional multi-centre study	Out-patients with SCI from study centers in Australia, Brazil, Canada, Israel, South Africa, and the US	<p>N=243 Mean age=41.4 ± 13.6 % male = 79.4 % female = 20.6 Mean time since onset = 139.6±138.8 months</p> <p>SCI</p> <p>% paraplegia = 45.7 % tetraplegia = 54.3</p> <p>Completeness of injury (AIS) % complete (A) = 47.7 % incomplete (B-D) = 43.6 % unspecified = 8.6</p>
Hitzig et al. 2012	Cross-sectional telephone survey	Rehabilitation institute	<p>N=618 (M=501; F=117) Mean age = 49.2y (18-92) Mean YPI = 16.3y (1-60)</p> <p>Community-dwelling SCI patients who were at least 1 year postinjury.</p> <p>Incomplete tetraplegia = 203 Complete tetraplegia = 102 Incomplete paraplegia = 156 Complete paraplegia = 157</p>
Johnston et al. 2005	Cross-sectional survey	New Jersey Outpatient SCI Center	<p>N=107 (88M, 19F) Mean age 39.1(11.16) Median age 38.0 Mean post-injury time: 11.36(9.56) yrs Median post-injury time: 8.71 yrs Community-living traumatic SCI individuals ASIA-A/B/C/D: 56.4%/20.2%/14.9%/8.5%</p> <p>Neurologic Category: Tetraplegia complete: 38.7% Tetraplegia incomplete: 15.1% Paraplegia complete: 37.6% Paraplegia incomplete: 8.6%</p>

Krause et al. 2009	Follow-up survey	Hospital in the Southeastern United States	727 SCI subjects mean age: 47.9 70.2% male 75.8% White 53.3% cervical injury Average years since injury = 18.2 A total of 1,385 participants were enrolled in the original study in 1997–1998. Participants were then contacted in 2007–2008 to participate in a follow-up survey. At that time, 306 were deceased, 34 could not be located, and 5 were eliminated. Responses were received by 727 participants, yielding an adjusted response rate of 69.5% percent.
Post et al. 2012	Cross-sectional study 5 years after discharge from inpatient rehab	8 rehab centres with specialized SCI units	145 SCI participants (104 men, 41 women) mean age: 45.4±13.7 27 incomplete paraplegia 65 complete paraplegia 16 incomplete tetraplegia 37 complete tetraplegia 116 traumatic SCI, 29 non-traumatic
Richardson & Richards 2008	Retrospective analysis	National Spinal Cord Injury Database (NSCID)	2570 participants 1 year postinjury: 682 subjects (535 M, 147F) mean age: 38.66±15.32 5 years postinjury: 517 subjects (402M, 115F) mean age: 40.26±14.53 15 years postinjury: 653 subjects (518M, 135F) mean age: 42.72±10.09 25 years postinjury: 718 subjects (558M, 160F) mean age: 49.49±8.60
Scherer & Cushman 2001	Cross-sectional	Acute medical rehabilitation unit in a general hospital	N=20 Age: 51.05±16.44, range 22-78 years 10 female, 10 male 13 paraplegia (4 complete), 7 tetraplegia (1 complete)

1. RELIABILITY

Author ID	Internal Consistency	Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater
Dijkers 1999	Principal component factor analysis revealed one factor, which explained 61.1% of the variance. Item loadings ranged from 0.64 to 0.84.	A subgroup (n=165) completed the SLWS twice, with a follow-up interval range of 93-626 days. Test-retest correlation for the whole scale was 0.65 and for individual items was between 0.39 and 0.60 (P<.001 for all).
Post et al. 2012	Cronbach's alpha for the whole scale = 0.83 Corrected item-to-total correlations for the questions ranged from 0.47 to 0.74	No data available

Geyh et al. 2010	No data available	Person reliability index: r=0.88
Krause et al. 2009	Cronbach's alpha= 0.92.	No data available
2. VALIDITY		
Author ID	Validity	
Dijkers 1999	<p><i>SWLS scores were correlated to those for the Functional Independence Measure (FIM) and the Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique (CHART).</i></p> <p>ANOVA and Eta². Both FIM subscales (motor and sociocognitive) and all four CHART subscales (physical independence, mobility, social integration and occupation) were significantly correlated to SLWS scores (P<.001). Effect size (Eta²): <u>FIM</u> motor = 0.05 sociocognitive = 0.02 <u>CHART</u> physical independence = 0.14 mobility = 0.11 social integration = 0.11 occupation = 0.14</p> <p>Stepwise Regression Analysis. (Beta weights and significance level indicated in brackets.)</p> <p>Adding the FIM motor (0.21, P<.0001) and sociocognitive (0.10, P<.0001) variables into the regression produced an R² value of 0.14. Adding the CHART subscales of physical independence, mobility (0.26, P<.0001), occupation (0.10, P<.001) and social integration (0.11, P<.0001) produced an R² value of 0.23.</p>	
Scherer & Cushman 2001	<p><u>Spearman correlations between the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI), SWLS and Assistive Technology Device Predisposition Assessment (ATD-PA) QOL subset</u> ATD-PA QOL & SWLS: $\rho=0.89$, (P<.01) BSI & SWLS: $\rho=-0.64$, (P<.01)</p> <p>Correlations between the 5 SWLS and 11 QOL subset items were positive and generally high, with the exception of QOL item 16. Of the 55 correlation coefficients among SWLS and QOL items, 69.1% were significant: 18 at P<.01 and 20 at P<.05.</p>	
Post et al. 2012	<p>(ns = P>.05) Correlation between the SWLS and scales measuring different constructs: FIM-Motor: 0.14 (ns) Level of injury: 0.21 (P<.05) Completeness of injury: 0.15 (ns) Cause of injury: 0.02 (ns) Age: -0.19 (P<.05) Sex: 0.02 (ns) Education: 0.05 (ns)</p> <p>Spearman's correlations: Correlation between the SWLS and scales measuring the same construct as the SWLS:</p>	

	Life Satisfaction Questionnaire (LISAT-9) vs. SWLS: 0.60 (ns) SWLS vs. MHI-5 (mental health subscale of SF-36): 0.48 (P<.01) SWLS vs. SIP-SOC (social dimension of SIP-68): -0.41 (P<.01)
Richards on & Richards 2008	With PHQ-9: Among persons 1 year postinjury, both affective and somatic subscores showed a significant inverse correlation with satisfaction with life ($r_s = -.463$, $P < .001$, and $r_s = -.346$, $P < .001$, respectively). Significant negative correlations were also found between SWLS scores and factor subscores at 5 years postinjury ($r_s = -.415$, $P < .001$ for the somatic subscore; $r_s = -.456$, $P < .001$ for the affective subscore) and at 15 years postinjury ($r_s = -.404$, $P < .001$, for the affective subscore; $r_s = -.248$, $P < .001$, for the somatic subscore). Authors did not state if the negative correlation was expected. Regarding the 25 years postinjury group, the affective subscale also correlated significantly, and in a negative direction, with satisfaction with life ($r_s = -.368$, $P < .001$). A significant negative relationship was also found with the somatic subscale for the 25 year postinjury group ($r_s = -.255$, $P < .001$).
Hitzig et al. 2012	To evaluate the construct validity of the Reintegration to Normal Living Index (RNL) compared with the SWLS, a 3 factor CFA model was fit to the combined items of both scales. A 1-factor CFA of items of both scales yielded poor fit (RMSEA = 0.173, CFI = 0.822, TLI = 0.908). The 3-factor model was an appropriate fit (RMSEA = 0.067, CFI = 0.963, TLI = 0.986). Interfactor correlations showed a stronger relationship between the scores of the 2 factors of the RNL Index than between each factor and the SWLS. Hence, the 3-factor CFA supports our hypothesis that the SWLS and RNL Index assess distinct, although related, constructs.
Krause et al. 2009	<u>Spearman Rank correlations between SWLS and:</u> Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9): -0.477 Major depressive disorder: -0.335 Older Adult Health and Mood Questionnaire (OAHMQ): -0.538 ($P < .0001$ for all the above)
Johnston et al. 2005	Pearson's r btwn SWLS and ASIA Motor Score: -0.07 ($P = 0.55$)

3. RESPONSIVENESS – no data available

4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT – no data available

5. INTERPRETABILITY

Author ID	Interpretability														
Dijkers 1999	<p>Summary statistics for the 5 SWLS items and SWLS total: (n=2183)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Mean (SD)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. In most ways my life is close to ideal</td> <td>3.76 (2.06)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. The conditions of my life are excellent</td> <td>3.75 (2.01)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. I am satisfied with my life</td> <td>4.34 (2.02)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life</td> <td>4.28 (2.01)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing</td> <td>3.29 (2.10)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SWLS total</td> <td>19.4 (7.9)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>SEM for total SWLS (calculated from data in Dijkers et al. 1999): 4.67 MDC for total SWLS (calculated from data in Dijkers et al. 1999): 12.95</p>	Item	Mean (SD)	1. In most ways my life is close to ideal	3.76 (2.06)	2. The conditions of my life are excellent	3.75 (2.01)	3. I am satisfied with my life	4.34 (2.02)	4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life	4.28 (2.01)	5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	3.29 (2.10)	SWLS total	19.4 (7.9)
Item	Mean (SD)														
1. In most ways my life is close to ideal	3.76 (2.06)														
2. The conditions of my life are excellent	3.75 (2.01)														
3. I am satisfied with my life	4.34 (2.02)														
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life	4.28 (2.01)														
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	3.29 (2.10)														
SWLS total	19.4 (7.9)														
Scherer & Cushman 2001	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Mean (SD)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. In most ways my life is close to ideal</td> <td>3.40 (2.58)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. The conditions of my life are excellent</td> <td>3.05 (2.04)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. I am satisfied with my life</td> <td>4.05 (2.46)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life</td> <td>4.05 (2.11)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Mean (SD)	1. In most ways my life is close to ideal	3.40 (2.58)	2. The conditions of my life are excellent	3.05 (2.04)	3. I am satisfied with my life	4.05 (2.46)	4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life	4.05 (2.11)				
Item	Mean (SD)														
1. In most ways my life is close to ideal	3.40 (2.58)														
2. The conditions of my life are excellent	3.05 (2.04)														
3. I am satisfied with my life	4.05 (2.46)														
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life	4.05 (2.11)														

5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	3.45 (2.19)
SWLS total	10.5 (5.9)

Geyh et al. 2010

SWLS scores for 6 countries

Item	ALL (n=243) Mean (SD)	AUS (n=40) Mean (SD)	BRZ (n=34) Mean (SD)	CAN (n=34) Mean (SD)	ISR (n=71) Mean (SD)	RSA (n=30) Mean (SD)	USA (n=34) Mean (SD)
SWLS 1	3.3 (1.9)	2.9 (1.4)	3.5 (1.8)	4.1 (2.1)	3.3 (1.8)	2.5 (1.7)	3.6 (2.2)
SWLS 2	3.5 (1.9)	3.4 (1.5)	3.7 (1.7)	4.2 (2.1)	3.5 (1.9)	2.7 (1.8)	3.7 (2.2)
SWLS 3	4.0 (1.9)	4.1 (1.4)	3.7 (2.0)	4.4 (2.0)	3.9 (1.9)	3.6 (1.9)	4.3 (2.1)
SWLS 4	3.9 (1.8)	4.0 (1.4)	3.5 (2.0)	4.6 (1.7)	3.8 (1.8)	3.0 (1.4)	4.4 (1.8)
SWLS 5	3.5 (1.9)	2.9 (1.4)	2.9 (1.8)	3.0 (1.7)	4.8 (1.9)	2.3 (1.3)	3.5 (2.0)
SWLS total	18.2 (7.4)	17.2 (6.0)	17.3 (7.5)	20.2 (7.7)	19.3 (7.1)	14.1 (6.7)	19.6 (8.5)

AUS = Australia
 BRZ = Brazil
 CAN = Canada
 ISR = Israel
 RSA = Republic of South-Africa
 USA = United States of America

Standard error of item location for the SWLS items:

Item	SE
SWLS 1	0.05
SWLS 2	0.05
SWLS 3	0.05
SWLS 4	0.06
SWLS 5	0.05

Hitzig et al. 2012

Mean SWLS score = 21.4±7.4