

Reviewer ID: Zoe Raffard/Matthew Querée			
Type of Outcome Measure: Physical Activity Scale for Individuals With Physical Disabilities (PASIPD)			Total articles: 3
Author ID Year	Study Design	Setting	Population (sample size, age) and Group
Washburn et al. 2002	Mail survey	Previous users of rehabilitative services (Midwestern university)	M=227, mean age=51 W=145, mean age= 48 80% spinal cord or other locomotor injuries 56 paraplegia, 38 quadriplegia, 30 cerebral palsy, 77 post-polio
Van Den Berg-Emons et al. 2011	Cross-sectional	Participants' home environment	N = 124 total patients (cerebral palsy, meningomyelocele, or SCI) N= 21 SCI patients (14M, 7F) Mean age: 40.7±14.3y Patients with SCI Ambulatory status (determined according to the classification of Hoffer et al.): 1 = 0 2 = 0 3 = 5 4 = 16
van der Ploeg et al. 2007	Test-retest study assessing measurement properties	Community – former patients of 3 Dutch rehabilitation centers	N = 45 (18M, 27F) participants, all wheelchair non-dependent (stroke, spinal cord injury, whiplash, and neurological-, orthopedic- or back disorders) Mean age ± SD (y) 47 ± 12
1. RELIABILITY			
Author ID	Internal Consistency	Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater	
Washburn et al. 2002	Cronbach's alpha = 0.37- 0.65, indicating low to moderate internal consistency within factors, (P<.05)	No data available	
van der Ploeg et al. 2007		The test-retest reliability Spearman correlation of the PASIPD was 0.77 (P>0.05). Mean Scores ± (SD) First PASIPD - 74.9 ± 58.8 Second PASIPD - 65.1 ± 44.6 -	
2. VALIDITY			
Author ID	Validity		
Washburn et al. 2002	<u>Pearson correlation</u> between survey items and total PASIPD score: all statistically significant (P<.05) and >0.20 (range: r=0.20-0.67) <u>Factor analysis</u> five latent factors: 1.Home, lawn and garden repair 2.Housework 3.Vigorous sport and recreation		

	<p>4. Light sport and recreation 5. Occupation and transportation (>1 eigenvalues, >0.4 factor loading): Account for 63% of variance</p> <p><u>Group differentiation:</u> scored differently between groups by age, physical activity level, and self-rated health status.</p>
Van Den Berg-Emons et al. 2011	<p>No significant Spearman correlation coefficients between the PASIPD and activity monitor outcome measures were found for SCI patients:</p> <p><i>Activity monitor duration x PASIPD duration</i> Spearman's $\rho = 0.31$ ($P = .18$)</p> <p><i>Activity monitor duration x PASIPD intensity</i> Spearman's $\rho = 0.28$ ($P = .22$)</p>
van der Ploeg et al. 2007	<p>The criterion validity Spearman correlation was 0.30 when compared to the accelerometer. The reported criterion validity correlation of the PASIPD (0.30) was similar to that of physical activity questionnaires for the general population. A review reported correlations between questionnaires and accelerometers from 0.14 to 0.53 (median approximately 0.30).</p>
3. RESPONSIVENESS – no data available	
4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT – no data available	
5. INTERPRETABILITY	
Author ID	SEM, MDC, MCID, normative & published data
Washburn et al. 2002	<p>Total and Subcategory mean (SD) scores for the PASIPD: group = locomotor/SCI disability (n=260)</p> <p>Total score: 19.8 (14.4)</p> <p>Home Repair/Gardening: 1.5 (3.4)</p> <p>Housework: 2.5 (3.2)</p> <p>Vigorous Sport: 2.4 (5.6)</p> <p>Moderate Sport: 1.4 (2.9)</p> <p>Occupation: 11.9 (10.2)</p>
Van den Berg-Emons 2011	<p>Mean (SD) PASIPD intensity score for SCI patients: 10.9 (12.0) MET* hours/day</p> <p>*MET = metabolic equivalent</p>