

Reviewer ID: Christie Chan, John Zhu, Jeremy Mak, Matthew Querée, Risa Fox			
Type of Outcome Measure: Moorong Self-Efficacy Scale (MSES)			Total articles: 4
Author ID Year	Study Design	Setting	Population (sample size, age) and Group
Middleton et al. 2016	Cross-sectional survey	Australia and US (Miami Project research volunteer registry in US, not specified in AUS)	<p>Total:            N=161 (118M, 43F)            Age: 48.5±15.1 years            Level of injury: 86 paraplegic, 75 tetraplegic            Time postinjury: 16.2±12.2 years</p> <p>Australia:            N=82            Age: 48.6±13.1 years            Level of injury: 44 paraplegic, 38 tetraplegic            Time postinjury: 15.8±13.7 years</p> <p>US:            N=79            Age: 48.5±13.1 years            Level of injury: 42 paraplegic, 37 tetraplegic            Time postinjury: 16.7±10.5 years</p>
Kilic et al. 2013	Cross sectional Survey	Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre, South Australia	<p>N=60 (19F, 41M)            Age: 50.8 ± 17.0</p> <p>Time Since Injury (years): 5.7 ± 7.3</p> <p>Incomplete lesion: 41            Complete: 18            Missing data: 1</p>
Middleton et al. 2003	Descriptive, correlational study, validation study of a new instrument	Moorong Spinal Unit of the Royal Rehabilitation Centre Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.	<p>Sample 1: People with SCI living in the community who previously were at in-patient rehabilitation            N=36, 28 male            Mean age 36.33 (SD = 9.52)            Mean time post-trauma 11.23 (SD = 9.67) years            11 paraplegia, 25 tetraplegia            15 incomplete, 21 complete</p> <p>Sample 2: People who had recently sustained a SCI and were currently enrolled at in-patient rehabilitation            N=31, 23 male            Mean age 31.48 (SD = 10.46)            Mean time post-trauma 2.01 (SD = 2.50) months            21 paraplegia, 10 tetraplegia            13 incomplete, 18 complete</p> <p>Sample 3: People with SCI living in the community who previously were at in-patient rehabilitation            N=108, 30 male            Mean age 45.26 (SD = 15.99)            Mean time post-trauma 7.92 (SD = 9.83) years            66 paraplegia, 42 tetraplegia</p>

			58 incomplete, 49 complete
Miller 2009	Study examining factorial and concurrent validity	Florida Brain and Spinal Cord Injury Program and the Florida Spinal Cord Injury Resource Centre	162 SCI participants (68.5% male, 31.5% female) mean age: 45.8±13.4 mean years post-injury: 9.2±8.6  Ethnic background: 73.5% European American 14.2% African American 7.4% Latino/Latina 2.5% Native American 2.5% Asian American.  Injury level: 54.3% cervical 40.8% thoracic 3.7% lumbar 1.2% sacral
Munce et al. 2016	Online Survey	Rick Hansen Institute and an outpatient spinal clinic	N=99 Age: 50.5 ± 1.0  Time Since Injury (years): 17.5 ± 12.3

**1. RELIABILITY**

Author ID	Internal Consistency	Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater
Middleton et al. 2016	Factor 1 (social function self-efficacy; 5 items): α=.77  Factor 2 (general self-efficacy; 4 items): α=.81  Factor 3 (personal function self-efficacy; 7 items): α=.80	no data available
Middleton et al. 2003	Item-total Spearman correlations (Sample 1 only, N=36): 6 of 8 items: 0.46-0.80 (P<0.01) Item 2 (bowel accidents): 0.17 (P>0.05) Item 4 (family relationships): 0.25 (P>0.05)	

**2. VALIDITY**

Author ID	Validity
Middleton et al. 2016	Negative correlation found between age and factor 1 (r=-.32, P<.01)  No sex differences found in factors 2 and 3, but women scored higher in factor 1 than men (P<.05)
Kilic et al. 2013	Negatively correlated with Depression portion of DASS-21 (Pearson r=-0.63, P< 0.01)  Negatively correlated with Anxiety portion of DASS-21 (Pearson r=-0.54, P< 0.01)

	Negatively correlated with Stress portion of DASS-21 (Pearson $r=-0.58$ , $P < 0.01$ )
Middleton et al. 2003	Spearman correlations of MSES with (Sample 1 only, N=36): Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) anxiety: $-0.58$ ( $P < 0.001$ ) Functional Independence Measure (FIM) motor(N=34): $0.04$ ( $P > 0.05$ ) FIM cognitive: $0.39$ ( $P < 0.05$ ) Sickness Impact Profile (SIP-136) physical: $-0.11$ ( $P > 0.05$ ) Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique (CHART) physical (N=29): $-0.07$ ( $P > 0.05$ ) CHART mobility: $0.15$ ( $P > 0.05$ ) CHART occupational: $0.47$ ( $P < 0.05$ ) CHART social: $-0.24$ ( $P > 0.05$ )
Miller 2009	MSES scores were found to be significantly positively related to Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) scores ( $r=0.51$ , $P < .001$ ) and Personal Resources Questionnaire-2000 (PRQ-2000) scores ( $r=0.56$ , $P < .001$ ). MSES scores were significantly negatively associated with Centre for Epidemiologic Diseases Depression Scale (CESD-10) scores ( $r=-0.54$ , $P < .001$ ). Employment status was found to be positively related to the total score of the MSES ( $r=0.23$ , $P < .001$ ). Years since disability, injury level and living situation were found to be unrelated to self-efficacy, as measured by the total score of the MSES.  Correlations of Moorong Self-Efficacy Scale Factors with selected variables:  MSES Factor 1 (Interpersonal): Years since injury: $-.018$ Injury Level: $-.051$ Living situation: $.087$ Employment: $.222$ ( $P < .01$ ) SWLS: $.473$ ( $P < .001$ ) CESD-10: $-.557$ ( $P < .001$ ) PRQ-2000: $.625$ ( $P < .001$ )  MSES Factor 2 (instrumental): Years since injury: $-.079$ Injury Level: $.027$ Living situation: $.011$ Employment: $.305$ ( $P < .001$ ) SWLS: $.495$ ( $P < .001$ ) CESD-10: $-.494$ ( $P < .001$ ) PRQ-2000: $.465$ ( $P < .001$ )
Munce et al. 2016	Negatively correlated with Depression portion of HADS (Spearman $\rho=-0.560$ , $P < 0.01$ )  Negatively correlated with Anxiety portion of HADS (Spearman $\rho=-0.315$ , $P < 0.01$ )

### 3. RESPONSIVENESS

Author ID	Responsiveness
Middleton et al. 2003	Wilcoxon signed-ranks tests (Sample 2 only, N=31):  Test occasion 1 (T1) – 1-month post remobilization following acute treatment Test occasion 2 (T2) – 3-month post remobilization Test occasion 3 (T3) – 6-month post remobilization  Significant improvement in between T1 & T2 in: Total score: $z = -3.29$ , $P < 0.01$ Item 1 (personal hygiene): $z = -3.34$ , $P < 0.001$ Item 3 (household participation): $z = -3.34$ , $P < 0.05$

	<p>Item 8 (leisure): <math>z = -3.09</math>, <math>P &lt; 0.01</math> Item 12 (accomplishing things): <math>z = -2.18</math>, <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> Item 14 (meeting people): <math>z = -1.99</math>, <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> Item 15 (good health): <math>z = -2.24</math>, <math>P &lt; 0.05</math></p> <p>Significant improvement in between T2 &amp; T3 in: Total score: <math>z = -0.01</math>, <math>P &gt; 0.05</math> Item 13 (persistence in learning things): <math>z = -2.24</math>, <math>P &lt; 0.05</math></p> <p>No significant difference found in total score between any test occasions comparing lesion levels or completeness of injury.</p>
	<b>4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT</b> – no data available
	<b>5. INTERPRETABILITY</b> – no data available
Middleton et al. 2003	<b>Mean (SD) Scores</b>  Sample 1: Time 1 (in outpatient clinic) = 92.15 (16.57) Time 2 (6 weeks later) = 94.81 (14.95)  Sample 2: 2