Reviewer ID: Kyle Diab, Gurmaan Gill			
Type/Name of Outcome Measure: Sense of Well-Being Inventory (SWBI)			**Total articles: 3**

Author ID Year	Study Design	Setting	Population (sample size, age) and Group
Chapin et al. 2004	Cross-sectional	Recruited from Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, and Manitoba chapters of the Canadian Paraplegic Association	N = 132 with paraplegic SCI Mean (SD) Age = 45.82 (15.67) years 77% men Mean (SD) duration since injury = 15.21 (11.63) months; Range = 1.08 to 50.92 months 51% engaged or married 83% in middle class 61% completed high school, 42% with postsecondary education or training At time of injury: 67% employed At time of survey: 19% were employed full-time, with 6% employed part-time, 9% in training, and 67% not employed.
Catalano et al. 2010	Quantitative descriptive research design – Cross-sectional	Recruited from Canadian Paraplegic Association	N = 413 with paraplegic SCI Mean (SD) age = 46.41 years (14.09) 71% were men Mean (SD) duration since injury = 29.30 months (14.45); range=1 to 77 months 86% were white (6% of aboriginal, 5% of non-white, and 3% of others) 44 % were either engaged or married 80% had completed high school, including 48% with some post-secondary education or training At the time of the survey, 30% were employed full-time.
deRoon-Cassini et al. 2009	Cross-sectional	Clement J. Zablocki VA Medical Center Milwaukee, WI	N= 79 veterans with SCI 76 men Mean age = 55.9 years (SD = 11.0) Mean (SD) duration of injury = 17.5 (14.7) months 21 incomplete paraplegia, 20 complete paraplegia, 34 partial tetraplegia, 4 complete tetraplegia 80% Caucasian, 11% African American, 4% Native American, and 5% other 10% were employed (n = 13) Mean number of years of education = 13.9 (SD = 2.3) Mean income = $34,000 ($SD$ = 26,000) 44% lived alone 33% were divorced, 30% were married, 26% were single, 8% in a committed relationship or dating, 3% other

1. RELIABILITY

Author ID	Internal Consistency	Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater
Chapin et al. 2004	Cronbach's alpha: Psychological Well-Being = 0.87 Financial Well-Being = 0.88 Family and Social Well-Being = 0.84 Physical Well-Being = 0.79	n/a
Catalano	Cronbach's alpha:	n/a

et al. 2010	Psychological Well-Being = 0.82 Financial Well-Being = 0.81 Family and Social Well-Being = 0.85 Physical Well-Being = 0.81	

2. VALIDITY		

Author ID	Validity
Chapin et al. 2004	**Principal Axis Factor Analysis:** The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) resulted in a measure of sampling adequacy of 0.84 (greater than 0.50) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity (x^2 = 2203.96, df = 630, p < 0.001) allowed researchers to proceed with factor analysis. Eight factors were indicated using The Kaiser-Guttman rule (eigenvalue greater than one), resulting in trivial factors. Cattell's scree test was then used as an alternative to determine the number of factors to be retained. Four factors were indicated using this method: Psychological Well-Being, Financial Well-Being, Family and Social Well-Being, and Physical Well-Being. **Convergent Validity:** Correlations between SWBI subscales and World Health Organization Quality of Life-Brief Version (WHOQOL-BREF) subscales: SWBI psychological well-being subscale and WHOQOL-BREF psychological subscale: r = 0.75, P<0.01 SWBI physical well-being subscale and WHOQOL-BREF physical health subscale: r = 0.63, p<0.01 SWBI family and social well-being subscale and WHOQOL-BREF social relationships scale: r = 0.45, p<0.01 SWBI financial well-being subscale and WHOQOL-BREF environment subscale: r = 0.59, p<0.0001
Catalano et al. 2010	**Exploratory Factor Analysis:** The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) resulted in a measure of sampling adequacy of .91 (greater than .50) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity, c2(630, *N* = 202) = 3893.01, *p* < .001, indicated that it was appropriate to proceed with exploratory factor analysis. A four-factor solution was chosen using The Kaiser-Guttman rule (eigenvalue greater than one) and Cattell's scree test. Exploratory factor analysis resulted in minor relocation and elimination of some items, reducing the instrument to 20 items. **Confirmatory Factor Analysis:** The results indicated that the data did not fit the single factor model. The model fit for the four-factor intercorrelated and the four-factor hierarchical factor models were excellent. The four-factor intercorrelated model represents a significantly better explanation of the data than the single factor model. **Convergent Validity:** Acceptance of Disability Scale (ADS) Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) Bivariate Correlations between SWBI subscales and other scales <table><tr><td></td><td>SHS</td><td>ADS</td><td>RSES</td></tr><tr><td>Financial WB</td><td>.45*</td><td>.37*</td><td>.42*</td></tr><tr><td>Psychological WB</td><td>.72*</td><td>.59*</td><td>.76*</td></tr><tr><td>Family and social WB</td><td>.58*</td><td>.44*</td><td>.49*</td></tr><tr><td>Physical WB</td><td>.46*</td><td>.50*</td><td>.49*</td></tr></table>*P<.01
deRoon-Cassini et al. 2009	Perceived loss of physical functioning: items from the Conservation of Resources—Evaluation (COR-E) and SF-36 Health Survey Global meaning making: Purpose in Life (PIL) scale Psychological well-being: Psychological well-being SWBI subscale

	Bivariate correlations between: Psychological well-being and Perceived loss of physical functioning = -.30 (P<.01) Psychological well-being and Global meaning making = .71 (P<.01)
3. RESPONSIVENESS	
Author ID	**Responsiveness**
4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT	
Author ID	**Floor/ceiling effect**
5. INTERPRETABILITY	
Author ID	**Interpretability**
Chapin et al. 2004	Mean (SD) well-being rating for each subscale: Psychological Well-Being = 2.68 (0.62) Financial Well-Being = 2.73 (0.66) Family and Social Well-Being = 3.14 (0.57) Physical Well-Being = 2.70 (0.60)
Catalano et al. 2010	Mean (SD) well-being rating for each subscale: Psychological Well-Being = 2.75 (0.61) Financial Well-Being = 2.93 (0.70) Family and Social Well-Being = 3.22 (0.60) Physical Well-Being = 2.82 (0.63)