

Reviewer ID: Kristine Vaughan, John Zhu, Jeremy Mak, Ben Mortenson, Matthew Querée, Gita Manhas			
Type of Outcome Measure: Community Integration Questionnaire (CIQ)			Total articles: 5
Author ID Year	Study Design	Setting	Population (sample size, age) and Group
Callaway et al. 2017	Matched analysis	Victoria, Australia	N=40, 61% male Mean age (SD): 58 (14.5) 77% traumatic SCI
Kratz et al. 2015	Longitudinal 12 month survey study	US Nation-wide, community dwelling	N=627 (228F, 399M), at time 1 Mean age 48.28, SD=13.50 Time Since Injury (years): 16.52 ± 12.67 234 complete SCI Etiology: 272 MVA, 91 falls, 68 sports, 57 medical/surgical, 45 violence  N=494 (193F, 301M), at time 2 (part of time 1 group) Time Since Injury (years): 16.15 ± 11.98
Saffari et al. 2015	Cross-sectional validation study for Iranian version of SCL CSQ (in Persian)		N=220, 164 male Mean age 58.18; s.d.=10.32 140 paraplegia, 80 tetraplegia 153 traumatic SCI, 67 non-traumatic  Time since injury (SD) = 50.96 (35.05) months
Gontkovsky et al. 2009	Correlational analysis, single session study	Tertiary care rehab centers (Inpatient rehabilitation at Methodist Rehabilitation Center)	N= 28, 75 % male Mean age = 42 ±17  57% at their 1-year follow up 29% at their 2-year follow up 14% at their 3-year follow up  90% traumatic SCI  68% incomplete SCI 32% complete SCI  AIS Classification 32.1% A 32.1% B 14.4% C 21.4% D  Level of Injury 60.7% Cervical 35.7% Thoracic 3.6% Lumbar
Rintala et al. 2002	Descriptive data, comparison of Spanish and English versions, and test-retest comparisons of the Spanish version	Southeastern Texas, USA	N=99, 81 male Mean duration (SD): 7.0 (6.5) 29 traumatic  Bilingual subsample: n=45, 33 male Mean duration (SD): 7.8 (7.4) 15 traumatic

			Test-retest subsample: n=46, 44 male Mean duration (SD): 6.9 (5.9) 9 traumatic																																													
<b>1. RELIABILITY</b>																																																
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Internal Consistency</b>	<b>Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater</b>																																														
Kratz et al. 2015	Cronbach's alpha: Total score: 0.75 at time 1, 0.71 at time 2* Home subscale: 0.79~0.81 Social subscale: 0.62~0.63 Productive subscale: 0.50~0.51  * Time 1 is initial survey, time 2 is 12 months after time 1																																															
Rintala et al. 2002	Cronbach's alpha: Total score: 0.70 Home subscale: 0.82 Social subscale: 0.33 Productive subscale: 0.42	Test-retest correlations: 0.85																																														
<b>2. VALIDITY</b>																																																
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Validity</b>																																															
Gontkovsky et al. 2009	Inter-correlation coefficients between CIQ scores:  CIQ Subscales: Home integration subscale (HIS) Social integration subscale (SIS) Productive Activity subscale (PAS)																																															
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CIQ Subscales:</th> <th>SIS</th> <th>PAS</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>HIS</td> <td>0.42*</td> <td>0.26</td> <td>0.80**</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SIS</td> <td></td> <td>0.34</td> <td>0.82**</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PAS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.61**</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				CIQ Subscales:	SIS	PAS	Total	HIS	0.42*	0.26	0.80**	SIS		0.34	0.82**	PAS			0.61**																												
CIQ Subscales:	SIS	PAS	Total																																													
HIS	0.42*	0.26	0.80**																																													
SIS		0.34	0.82**																																													
PAS			0.61**																																													
	*P<.05 **P<.01																																															
	The Craig Handicap Assessment Reporting Technique-Short Form (CHART-SF) and CIQ total scores were positively and significantly correlated (r = 0.79). The greatest degree of association was found between the social integration subscales of each measure (r = 0.77).																																															
	Correlation coefficients (r's)																																															
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="4">CIQ subscales:</th> </tr> <tr> <th>HIS</th> <th>SIS</th> <th>PAS</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CHART-SF subscales:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Physical Independence</td> <td><b>0.55</b></td> <td>0.01</td> <td>0.14</td> <td>0.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cognitive Independence</td> <td><b>0.57</b></td> <td>0.43</td> <td>0.07</td> <td><b>0.53</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mobility</td> <td><b>0.52</b></td> <td><b>0.68</b></td> <td>0.39</td> <td><b>0.73</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Occupation</td> <td><b>0.56</b></td> <td>0.46</td> <td>0.41</td> <td><b>0.64</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social Integration</td> <td>0.47</td> <td><b>0.77</b></td> <td>0.34</td> <td><b>0.73</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economic Self-Sufficiency</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>0.37</td> <td>0.24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					CIQ subscales:				HIS	SIS	PAS	Total	CHART-SF subscales:					Physical Independence	<b>0.55</b>	0.01	0.14	0.33	Cognitive Independence	<b>0.57</b>	0.43	0.07	<b>0.53</b>	Mobility	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.68</b>	0.39	<b>0.73</b>	Occupation	<b>0.56</b>	0.46	0.41	<b>0.64</b>	Social Integration	0.47	<b>0.77</b>	0.34	<b>0.73</b>	Economic Self-Sufficiency	0.25	0.01	0.37	0.24
	CIQ subscales:																																															
	HIS	SIS	PAS	Total																																												
CHART-SF subscales:																																																
Physical Independence	<b>0.55</b>	0.01	0.14	0.33																																												
Cognitive Independence	<b>0.57</b>	0.43	0.07	<b>0.53</b>																																												
Mobility	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.68</b>	0.39	<b>0.73</b>																																												
Occupation	<b>0.56</b>	0.46	0.41	<b>0.64</b>																																												
Social Integration	0.47	<b>0.77</b>	0.34	<b>0.73</b>																																												
Economic Self-Sufficiency	0.25	0.01	0.37	0.24																																												

	total	<b>0.74</b>	0.57	0.42	<b>0.79</b>
	<b>Bold P&lt;.001</b> <i>Italic P&lt;.05</i>				
Saffari et al. 2015	Pearson correlation coefficients: Between CIQ (Persian) and SCL CSQ subscale of: Acceptance: r=0.289,P<0.01 Fighting spirit: r=0.326,P<0.01 Social reliance: r=-0.272,P<0.01 (higher social participation was correlated with lower social reliance)  Predictive validity - Regression analysis: SCL CSQ Acceptance, fighting spirit and social reliance subscale, and SCI etiology predicts CIQ; R <sup>2</sup> = 0.38				
Rintala et al. 2002	Pearson correlation coefficients: Between CIQ (Spanish) and CHART (Spanish) scales: r = 0.53 Between CIQ (Spanish) and CIQ (English): r = 0.83				
<b>3. RESPONSIVENESS</b> – no data available					
<b>4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT</b>					
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Floor/ceiling Effect</b>				
Kratz et al. 2015	Patients at ceiling (time 1, time 2): Total Score: 0%, 5% Home subscale: 6.4%, 7.7% Social subscale: 1.6%, 2.0% Productive subscale: 25%, 27.1% Patients at floor: Total Score: 0.2% Home subscale: 1.2%, 1.3% Social subscale: 0.6% Productive subscale: 8.1%, 8.6%				
<b>5. INTERPRETABILITY</b>					
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Interpretability</b>				
Gontkovsky et al. 2009	<b>Subscale:</b>	<b>Mean (SD) CIQ score:</b>			
	Home integration	3.5 (2.6)			
	Social integration	6.7 (2.5)			
	Productive activity	1.0 (1.6)			
	Total	11.2 (5.0)			
Callaway et al. 2017	Mean (SD) CIQ scores for different subscales: Home integration: 4.5 (3.3) Social integration: 8.5 (2.3) Productive activity: 3.4 (1.9) Total: 16.4 (6.1)				