Author Year Country Research Design Score Total Sample Size	Methods	Outcome
Bassett-Gunter, Martin Ginis, and Latimer-Cheung (2013) Canada RCT PEDro=9 N=96	**Population:** Age=45±12yr.; Gender: males=57, females=37, not reported=2; Level of injury: Not reported; Level of severity: Not reported; Time since injury>1yr. **Intervention:** Following participant recruitment and screening, baseline measures of vulnerability, response efficacy, and intentions were electronically mailed to each participant. Once baseline measures were complete, a two-step randomization procedure was followed to test the hypotheses regarding the effects of (a) risk information on vulnerability and (b) the relative effects of gain- and loss-framed LTPA message on response efficacy, intentions, and cognitive processing. **Outcome Measures:** Vulnerability, Response Efficacy, Intention, Cognitive Processing.	Psychosocial variables: 1. Post hoc tests indicated a significant increase in disease vulnerability for the experimental condition only (p<0.001). 2. In the ANOVA considering response efficacy for disease risk, significant main effects for time were observed. 3. There were no significant main effects for condition or time by condition interaction effects for response efficacy. 4. In the ANOVA considering LTPA response efficacy for psychological health risk, main effects for time were superseded by a significant time by condition interaction effect. 5. Planned comparisons for each condition indicated a significantly greater increase in LTPA response efficacy for the loss-framed condition compared with the control and gain-framed conditions. 6. There was no significant difference in the magnitude of increase in LTPA response efficacy between the gain-framed and the control conditions. 7. A significant main effect for time was superseded by significant time by condition interaction effects. 8. Planned comparisons for each condition indicated a significantly greater increase in intentions for the loss-framed condition compared with the control condition and a trend toward a greater increase compared with the gain-framed condition. 9. There was no significant difference between the gain framed and control conditions. 10. Neither change in disease vulnerability (p>0.05) nor change in psychological health vulnerability (p>0.05) was a significant predictor of change in intentions. 11. Change in LTPA response efficacy for disease risk was not a significant predictor of change in intentions (p>0.05). 12. Change in response efficacy for psychological health risk was a significant and positive predictor of change in intentions (p>0.05).

		13. None of the individual cognitive processing variables differed between the gain- and loss-framed conditions at the Bonferroni adjusted value of ($p<0.013$): total thoughts ($p=0.02$); favorable thoughts ($p=0.04$); unfavorable thoughts ($p=0.23$); accurate recall ($p=0.07$).
Foulon et al. (2013) Canada RCT PEDro=6 N=79	**Population:** Gender: male=52, female=27; Level of injury: Paraplegia=37, Tetraplegia=42; Level of severity: AIS A=40, AIS B=10, AIS C=13, AIS D=15. Motivational Experimental Group: Mean age= 44.06yr, Mean time since injury: 20.39yr. Motivational Control group: Mean age=46.93yr, Mean time since injury: 23.21yr. Volitional Experimental Group: Mean age=42.17yr, Mean time since injury: 16.85yr. Volitional Control Group: Mean age=44.61yr, Mean time post injury: 12.70yr. **Intervention:** Based on a Health Action Process Approach (HAPA) participants were categorized as being in the motivational or volitional phase of behavior change and then randomly allocated to read an experimental vignette (EV) or a control vignette (CE). The informational portrait vignettes of the EV group were tailored to their demographic characteristics and targeted social cognitions for LTPA. The CE was not tailored and was written about a man with a SCI and did not talk about physical activity. **Outcome Measures:** Risk perception, outcome expectations, Task self-efficacy, Action planning, Intentions, Coping planning, Action control, Maintenance self-efficacy, Recovery self-efficacy, Perceived similarity with vignette character.	Psychosocial variables: 1. In the motivational group, those who read the EV felt more similar to the vignette character than CV group ($p<0.05$) on all dimensions except age and sex. 2. In the volitional group, those in the EV group felt more similar to the character on all measured dimensions ($p<0.05$). 3. There were no main effects of the condition or time for any of the HAPA constructs for any of the groups. 4. There was a significant condition x time interaction for coping plans. The motivational group had a non-significant decrease in coping plans among the EV group but no change for CV group. In the volitional group, there was a non-significant increase in coping plans for the CV group but no change for EV group.