Reviewer ID: Tyra Chu, Carlos L. Cano

Last Updated January 23rd, 2024

Research Summary - Spinal Cord Injury Functional Ambulation Inventory (SCI-FAI) - Lower Limb and Walking

Author Year Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
Lemay & Nadeau 2010 Longitudinal An intensive rehabilitation center in Montreal, Canada (Institut de readaptation Gingras-Lindsay de Montreal)	N= 32 SCI subjects (25M 7F) Mean age: 47.9± 12.8 yrs Neurological level: 15 paraplegic, 17 tetraplegic Level of injury: 17 cervical, 10 thoracic, 5 lumbar Type of injury: 21 traumatic, 11 non-traumatic Inclusion criteria: (1) Adults with SCI AIS D either of traumatic or nontraumatic etiology and (2) the ability to walk 10m independently with or without upper-extremity assistive devices.	**Spearman's correlations with other walking scales:** (all P<.01) <u>SCI-FAI parameter</u> BBS: 0.747 SCI-FAI assistive devices: 0.609 SCI-FAI mobility:0.716 2 Minute Walk Test (2MWT): 0.805 Walking Index for Spinal Cord Injury II (WISCI II): 0.761 10 Meter Walk Test (10MWT): 0.777 Timed Up and Go (TUG): -0.761 <u>SCI-FAI assistive devices</u> BBS: 0.714 SCI-FAI parameter: 0.609 SCI-FAI mobility: 0.690 2MWT: 0.740 WISCI II: 0.980		**Floor/Ceiling Effect:** A ceiling effect was present on the different sections of the SCI-FAI (parameter, assistive devices and walking mobility: 68.8%, 34.4%, 34.4%, respectively, of subjects reaching maximal score on the scale). **Interpretability:** See Table 1. below

Author Year Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		10MWT: 0.788 TUG: -0.802 SCI-FAI mobility BBS: 0.740 SCI-FAI parameter: 0.716 SCI-FAI assistive devices: 0.690 2MWT: 0.688 WISCI II: 0.630 10MWT: 0.756 TUG: -0.724		
	Table 1.			

Table 1.

Scale:	Mean (SD) score:	Range:
SCI-FAI Parameter (/20)	18.5 (3.3)	7-20
Paraplegia	17.8 (4.5)	7-20
Tetraplegia	19.0 (1.8)	14-20
SCI-FAI Assistive Devices (/14)	11.4 (2.7)	7-14
Paraplegia	11.1 (2.4)	7-14
Tetraplegia	11.8 (3.0)	7-14
SCI-FAI Mobility (/5)	3.7 (1.2)	2-5
Paraplegia	3.4 (1.2)	2-5
Tetraplegia	4 (1.1)	2-5

Reviewer ID: Tyra Chu, Carlos L. Cano

Last Updated January 23rd, 2024

Author Year Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
Datta et al. 2009 Observational Cohort The NeuroRecovery Network (NRN), a specialized network of treatment centers providing standardized, activity-based therapy for patients with SCI, USA	N=97 (M=71; F=26) Mean Age: 38±17y Mean time since SCI = 11.9 months Incomplete SCI AIS C or D	Correlation between the first principle component of change in Berg Balance Scale (BBS) items and changes in SCI-FAI subscales: <u>SCI-FAI Gait</u> Kendall τ = 0.22 Spearman p = 0.31 (P<.01) <u>SCI-FAI Assistive Device</u> Kendall τ = -0.07 (P=.42) Spearman p = -0.10 (P=.40) <u>SCI-FAI Walking Mobility</u> Kendall τ = 0.33 Spearman p = 0.44 (P<.01)		
Lam et al. 2008 Systematic Review	Data reported in the systematic review came only from one article- Field Fote et al.			**Interpretability:** Lam et al. 2008 calculated SEM and

Author Year Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
	2001 (see population characteristics below)			SRD from data in Field-Fote et al. 2001 **SEM**: 0.7 points (gait parameter subscale, Lam et al. 2008) **MDC**: Smallest Real Difference (SRD) = 1.9 points (13%) (gait parameter subscale, Lam et al. 2008)
Field-Fote et al. 2001 Methodological study testing reliability, validity, and sensitivity University of Miami, USA	N=22 (5F, 17M) Age: 32±13 Incomplete SCI 14 Cervical, 5 Thoracic, 3 Lumbar Ability to independently maintain stance on the weight-bearing limb and ability to take at least 8 steps. Sensitivity: N=19 (6 female, 13 male) Age:31.7±9.4 13 tetraplegia, 6 paraplegia	**Correlation of the SCI-FAI with instruments measuring the same construct as the SCI-FAI:** Gait Score & Walking Speed: VS1: r=-0.742 VS2: r=-0.700 Gait Score & Subject self report on walking mobility: VS1: r=0.697	**Inter-rater:** Live Score(LS): ICC=0.703 Videotape 1(VS1): ICC=0.800 Videotape 2(VS2): ICC=0.840 **Intra-rater:** Comparing LS & VS1 Rater 1: ICC=0.903 Rater 2: ICC=0.956 Rater 3: ICC=0.942 Rater 4: ICC=0.850	**Responsiveness:** Subjects who participated in experimental walking rehabilitation intervention, showed a 44.7% increase in mean gait score following training. This change was statistically significant (t-test, P<.001). Prior to training: Gait Score & LEMS: r=0.74 Post training: Gait Score & LEMS: r=0.64

Reviewer ID: Tyra Chu, Carlos L. Cano

Last Updated January 23rd, 2024

Author Year Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		There is a moderate correlation between % change in gait score and in change lower extremity motor scores (LEMS) (r=0.58)		