

**Appendix D.1: Outcome Measure Full Article Quality Screen – HTA Criteria Summary <sup>1</sup>**

Reviewer ID: Gurmaan Gill			
Type of Outcome Measure: FSFI			Total articles: 8
Author ID Year	Study Design	Setting	Population (sample size, age) and Group
Burri et al. 2010		King's College London, St. Thomas' Hospital, London, UK	N=1489 Mean Age ( $\pm$ SD): 56.3 ( $\pm$ 11.63) years Age Range: 25-82
Carpenter et al. 2016		Recruited from multiple communities	N=898 Mean Age ( $\pm$ SD): 54.47 ( $\pm$ 3.83) years Married/living with partner: 63.2% Bachelors' Degree or Higher: 52.7% Employed: 69.7% Ethnicity: Caucasian: 62.4% African American: 33.9% Hispanic: 2.8% Asian American: 2.3% Native American: 2.0% Other: 3.3% Perimenopausal: 18.1% Postmenopausal: 81.9%
Crisp et al. 2014	Online and paper survey		N=151 Mean Age ( $\pm$ SD): 43.4 ( $\pm$ 9.8) years Ethnicity: Caucasian: 131 (85.6%) African American: 18 (11.8%) Hispanic: 1 (0.7%) Asian: 0 (0%) Other: 2 (1.3%) Prefer not to answer: 1 (0.7%) Relationship Status: Single: 32 (21.1%) Married: 101 (66.4%) Separated: 6 (3.9%) Divorced: 10 (6.6%) Widowed: 3 (2.0%) Employment: Full Time: 90 (59.2%)

			Part Time: 25 (16.4%) Unemployed: 22 (14.5%) Retired: 4 (2.6%) Disabled: 11 (7.2%)
Isidori et al. 2010		Three outpatient clinics	N=200 (incl. 40 excluded) Sexual dysfunction (FSD): n=105 No sexual dysfunction (control): n=55  Mean age ( $\pm$ SD): 34.9 ( $\pm$ 6.9) Mean age range: 21-49  Mean age FSD group ( $\pm$ SD): 35.7 ( $\pm$ 6.9) Mean age range FSD group: 22-51  Mean age control group ( $\pm$ SD): 33.5 ( $\pm$ 6.8) Mean age range control group: 21-48  Other health conditions: Pain disorders: 19% Orgasmic disorders: 38% Lubrication disorders: 40% Excitation disorders: 43% Sexual desire disorder: 73%
Kalmbach et al. 2013	Cross-sectional study		N=748 women (1258 total) Mean age: 19.56 Mean age range: 18-29 years
Rosen et al. 2000	Validation study	Five research centers	N=259 (131 controls, 128 women with female sexual arousal disorder) Age Range: 21-69
Wiegel et al. 2005			N=568 With sexual dysfunction: 307 (54%) Without sexual dysfunction: 261 (46%)  Mean Age ( $\pm$ SD): 36.2 ( $\pm$ 13.2) Age Range: 18-74  Ethnicity: Caucasian: n=49 (73.3%) African American: n=49 (8.7%) Hispanic/Hispanic American: n=44 (7.8%) Asian American: n=10 (1.8%) Native American: n=3 (0.5%) Other/Unknown: n=44 (7.8%)  Marital Status: Single: n=466 (44.2%) Married: n=201 (43.1%) Divorced: n=59 (12.7%)
Wolpe et al. 2017		Selected from five different universities in Florianopolis, Brazil.	N=246 Mean age ( $\pm$ SD): 22.85 ( $\pm$ 5.59)  Marital Status: Single: 78.9% Married: 15% Widowed: 0.4% Did not report: 5.7%

		Education: Incomplete higher education: 89% Complete higher education: 4% Graduates: 0.8% Did not report: 5.2%  Family Income: <R\$362,000: 45% R\$362,000-724,000: 34.7% >R724,000: 7.7% Did not have family income: 12.6%
<b>1. RELIABILITY</b>		
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Internal Consistency</b>	<b>Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater</b>
Rosen et al. 2000	No data available	Test-Retest Range for FSFI domains (full sample): r=0.79-0.86 Test-Retest Range for FSFI domains (female sexual arousal disorder group): r=0.62-0.80 Test-Retest Range for FSFI domains (control group): r=0.77-0.89  Mean Test-Retest value (full sample): 0.88 Mean Test-Retest value (female sexual arousal disorder group): 0.70 Mean Test-Retest value (control group): 0.91  Cronbach alpha value (full sample): 0.97 Cronbach alpha value (female sexual arousal disorder group): 0.93j Cronbach alpha value (control group): 0.95
Wiegel et al. 2000	No data available	Cronbach alpha value: >0.9
Burri et al. 2010	No data available	Cronbach alpha value (original FSFI): 0.76-0.93 Cronbach alpha value (modified lifelong FSFI): 0.79-0.92
Isidori et al. 2010	No data available	Cronbach alpha value: 0.789 Test retest analysis: r=0.95 (P < 0.001, 95% CI 0.935–0.964)
Kalmbach et al. 2013	No data available	Cronbach alpha value: Desire: 0.89 Arousal: 0.87 Lubrication: 0.81 Orgasm: 0.88 Satisfaction: 0.87 Pain: 0.86
Wolpe et al. 2017	No data available	Test retest: ICC= 0.94 (ICC reported for total score )
<b>2. VALIDITY</b>		
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Validity</b>	
Rosen et al. 2000	The mean difference in scores between the FSAD and control groups is highly significant (p < 0.001).	
Burri et al. 2010	Results from confirmatory factor analysis:  Original FSFI: Chi squared to d.f. ratio: 2.5 (P=0.09) Comparative fit index: 0.96 Tucker-Lewis index: 0.960 Root mean square error approximation: 0.06  Modified lifelong FSFI:	

	Chi squared to d.f. ratio: 2.9 (P=0.06) Comparative fit index: 0.96 Tucker-Lewis index: 0.95 Root mean square error approximation: 0.06
Crisp et al. 2014	Correlation between online and paper FSFI tests: Total Score: r=0.934 (P=0.91) Desire: r=0.838 (P=0.10) Arousal: r=0.896 (P=0.23) Lubrication: r=0.900 (P=0.12) Orgasm: r=0.871 (0.24) Satisfaction: r=0.848 (P=0.67) Pain: r=0.851 (P=0.43)
Kalmbach et al. 2013	Results from confirmatory factor analysis: Chi squared: 303.01 (P=0.001) Comparative fit index: 0.97 Tucker-Lewis index: 0.95 Root mean square error approximation: 0.04
Wolpe et al. 2017	Correlation between original FSFI and FSFI-VAS: r=0.87 All domains had a correlation higher than 0.70
<b>3. RESPONSIVENESS</b>	
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Responsiveness</b>
<b>4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT – no data available</b>	
<b>5. INTERPRETABILITY</b>	
<b>Author ID</b>	<b>Interpretability</b>
Kalmbach et al. 2013	Mean (SD) of FSFI Measures before scaling: Desire: 6.65 (2.02) Arousal: 16.33 (3.59) Lubrication: 17.69 (3.05) Orgasm: 11.17 (3.52) Satisfaction: 12.28 (2.99) Pain: 12.63 (2.77)
Rosen et al. 2011	Mean (SD) of FSFI measures of women with female sexual arousal disorder before scaling: Desire: 4.7 (2.12) Arousal: 9.7 (4.78) Lubrication: 10.9 (5.48) Orgasm: 7.1 (4.08) Satisfaction: 8.2 (3.59) Pain: 10.1 (4.64)  Scaled total score: 19.2 (6.63)