

Research Summary – Transfer Assessment Instrument (TAI) & Transfer Assessment Instrument – Questionnaire (TAI-Q) – Wheeled Mobility

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
<p>Abou et al. 2023</p> <p>Cross-sectional study to evaluate the reliability of home-based remote and self-assessment of transfer quality using the TAI 4.0 and TAI-Q among wheelchair users with SCI.</p> <p>Participant's home environment.</p>	<p>N = 18 full-time manual wheelchair users with SCI Mean (SD) age 41.1 (14.2) years 12M, 6F Mean (SD) time since injury 7.8 (32.6) years Level of injury: Cervical (n = 3), high thoracic (n = 3), low thoracic (n = 8), lumbar (n = 2), and unknown (n = 2)</p>		<p>Interrater reliability of the total TAI score: ICCs = 0.57-0.90.</p> <p>Intrarater reliability of the total TAI score: ICC = 0.90</p> <p>Moderate to good intrarater and interrater reliability were found for all TAI subscores (ICC: 0.60–0.94) except for interrater reliability of flight/landing which was poor (ICC: 0.20). See table 1.</p>	<p>TAI scores: For the total TAI score, assessment #1 (live, rater 1) score was significantly higher compared to assessment #3 (asynchronous, average raters 2 & 3) and TAI-Q score (see table 2). Also, assessment #2 (asynchronous, rater 1) was significantly higher than assessment #3 (asynchronous, average raters 2 & 3) for total TAI score.</p> <p>The SEM and MDC for the remote home-based TAI total score range from 0.38 to 0.79 and 1.04 to 2.20,</p>

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability																																																																								
				respectively. The SEM and MDC for the TAI subscores range from 0.28 to 1.03 and 0.78 to 2.85, respectively (see table 2).																																																																								
	Table 1 depicts ICCs for interrater and intrarater reliability for total and subscores of the remote home-based TAI.																																																																											
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reliability construct</th> <th>Rater</th> <th>Assessment</th> <th>ICC, 95% CI</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="4">Total TAI score</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intrarater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Live</td> <td>0.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Asynchronous</td> <td>(0.75–0.96)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interrater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Live</td> <td>0.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Avg Rater 2&3</td> <td>Asynchronous</td> <td>(0.80–0.97)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interrater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Live</td> <td>0.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wheelchair User</td> <td>Live</td> <td>(0.16–0.84)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interrater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Asynchronous</td> <td>0.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Avg Rater 2&3</td> <td>Asynchronous</td> <td>(0.62–0.95)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">Wheelchair setup</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intrarater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Live</td> <td>0.83</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Asynchronous</td> <td>(0.56–0.94)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interrater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Live</td> <td>0.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Avg Rater 2&3</td> <td>Asynchronous</td> <td>(0.50–0.93)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interrater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Live</td> <td>0.91</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Wheelchair User</td> <td>Live</td> <td>(0.77–0.97)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interrater</td> <td>Rater 1</td> <td>Asynchronous</td> <td>0.85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Reliability construct	Rater	Assessment	ICC, 95% CI	Total TAI score				Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	0.90		Rater 1	Asynchronous	(0.75–0.96)	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.90		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.80–0.97)	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.57		Wheelchair User	Live	(0.16–0.84)	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	0.86		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.62–0.95)	Wheelchair setup				Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	0.83		Rater 1	Asynchronous	(0.56–0.94)	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.81		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.50–0.93)	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.91		Wheelchair User	Live	(0.77–0.97)	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	0.85
Reliability construct	Rater	Assessment	ICC, 95% CI																																																																									
Total TAI score																																																																												
Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	0.90																																																																									
	Rater 1	Asynchronous	(0.75–0.96)																																																																									
Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.90																																																																									
	Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.80–0.97)																																																																									
Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.57																																																																									
	Wheelchair User	Live	(0.16–0.84)																																																																									
Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	0.86																																																																									
	Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.62–0.95)																																																																									
Wheelchair setup																																																																												
Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	0.83																																																																									
	Rater 1	Asynchronous	(0.56–0.94)																																																																									
Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.81																																																																									
	Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.50–0.93)																																																																									
Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.91																																																																									
	Wheelchair User	Live	(0.77–0.97)																																																																									
Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	0.85																																																																									

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability			
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.59–0.94)			
	Body setup						
	Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	0.75			
		Rater 1	Asynchronous	(0.31–0.91)			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.60			
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.12–0.85)			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.86			
		Wheelchair User	Live	(0.62–0.95)			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	0.69			
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.18–0.89)			
	Flight/landing						
	Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	0.74			
		Rater 1	Asynchronous	(0.29–0.91)			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.20			
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(-1.18–0.70)			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	0.94			
		Wheelchair User	Live	(0.83–0.98)			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	0.51			
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	(0.29–0.82)			
/ICC Intraclass Coefficient Correlation, TAI Transfer Assessment Instrument.							
Table 2. Differences between average video raters, remote rater, and self-assessment of the TAI.							
Reliability construct	Rater	Assessment	TAI score				
			Average	SD	P-value	SEM	MD C
Total TAI score							
Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	8.08	1.21	0.58	0.38	1.06

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample		Validity	Reliability			Responsiveness Interpretability	
		Rater 1	Asynchronous	8.00	0.85			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	8.08	1.21	<0.01	0.38	1.04
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	7.58	1.19			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	8.08	1.21	<0.01	0.79	2.20
		Wheelchair User	Live	7.12	1.00			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	8.00	0.85	0.02	0.44	1.23
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	7.58	1.19			
	Wheelchair setup							
	Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	6.90	1.87	0.45	0.77	2.14
		Rater 1	Asynchronous	7.20	2.36			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	6.90	1.87	0.37	0.82	2.25
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	7.25	2.09			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	6.90	1.87	0.11	0.56	1.56
		Wheelchair User	Live	6.42	2.37			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	7.20	2.36	0.90	0.91	2.53
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	7.25	2.09			
	Body setup							
	Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	6.95	1.23	0.98	0.61	1.70
		Rater 1	Asynchronous	6.94	1.51			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	6.95	1.23	0.83	0.78	2.16
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	6.88	1.43			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	6.95	1.23	0.03	0.46	1.28
		Wheelchair User	Live	6.38	1.68			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	6.94	1.51	0.85	0.84	2.33

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability				
	Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	6.88	1.43				
	Flight/landing							
	Intrarater	Rater 1	Live	9.00	1.15	0.02	0.59	1.63
		Rater 1	Asynchronous	9.55	1.09			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	9.00	1.15	0.43	1.03	2.85
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	8.57	2.09			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Live	9.00	1.15	0.25	0.28	0.78
		Wheelchair User	Live	8.83	1.29			
	Interrater	Rater 1	Asynchronous	9.55	1.09	0.05	0.76	2.11
		Avg Rater 2&3	Asynchronous	8.57	2.09			
<p>MDC Minimal Detectable Change, SEM Standard Error Measurement, TAI Transfer Assessment Instrument. Bold values identify statistical significance ($P < 0.05$)</p>								
<p>Worobey et al. 2022</p> <p>Study to evaluate the reliability, standard error of measurement, minimum detectable</p>	<p>N = 44 wheelchair users 35M, 9F Mean (SD) age 56.5 (12.7) years Diagnostic category: Paraplegia (n = 20), tetraplegia (n = 2), SCI unspecified (n = 8), other neurologic diseases (n = 14)</p>		<p>Moderate to excellent reliability was found when scoring remotely for TAI total and subscores for intra-rater (ICC(3,1): 0.687 to 0.854), test-retest ((ICC(3,1):0.695 to 0.836), and inter-rater reliability</p>	<p>TAI scores: For transfer 1, total score and flight/landing subscore were significantly higher for the remote rater compared to the average across the in-person raters (Table 2). There were no</p>				

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
<p>change and item-level consistency of the TAI 4.0, when used to evaluate transfer quality remotely</p> <p>2017 National Veterans Wheelchair Games, Cincinnati, OH</p>	<p>Mean (SD) time since injury 17.4 (11.4) years</p>		<p>(ICC(3,5): 0.746 to 0.962). See table 1.</p>	<p>differences in the wheelchair setup or body setup subscores. The SEM and MDC for transfer 1 total score and wheelchair setup, body setup, and flight/landing subscores are shown in Table 2 and range from 0.42–0.88 and 1.15–2.44, respectively.</p> <p>Item Analysis: All items met the 75% cutoff (Table 3), with the majority of items exceeding 90% (12 out of 15 items). Fleiss Kappa is also presented in Table 3 with moderate agreement noted for scooting (item 8) and substantial agreement noted for all other items.</p>

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability																																																											
<p>Table 1. ICCs for inter-rater, intra-rater and test-retest reliability of the TAI total and subscores</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Inter-rater Transfer 1 (n=44)</th> <th>Intra-rater Transfer 1 vs 2 (n=43)</th> <th>Test-retest Transfer 1 vs 3 (n=29)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Score</td> <td>0.830 †</td> <td>0.687 #</td> <td>0.721#</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wheelchair setup</td> <td>0.962 *</td> <td>0.717 #</td> <td>0.695 #</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Body setup</td> <td>0.746 †</td> <td>0.729 #</td> <td>0.761 †</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flight/landing</td> <td>0.829 †</td> <td>0.854 †</td> <td>0.836 †</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* indicates excellent reliability (ICC > 0.9) † indicates good reliability (ICC: 0.75–0.9) # indicates moderate reliability (ICC: 0.5–0.74)</p> <p>Table 2. Transfer 1 TAI Scores, SEM and MDC for total, wheelchair setup, body setup and flight/landing across participants for in-person and remote assessment.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">TAI Score</th> <th rowspan="2">Rater</th> <th colspan="5">Transfer 1</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Average</th> <th>SD</th> <th>p-value</th> <th>SEM</th> <th>MDC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Total</td> <td>In-person</td> <td>7.56</td> <td>1.01</td> <td rowspan="2">0.021</td> <td rowspan="2">0.44</td> <td rowspan="2">1.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Remote</td> <td>7.70</td> <td>1.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Wheelchair Setup</td> <td>In-person</td> <td>6.73</td> <td>2.14</td> <td rowspan="2">0.631</td> <td rowspan="2">0.42</td> <td rowspan="2">1.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Remote</td> <td>6.77</td> <td>2.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Body Setup</td> <td>In-person</td> <td>7.69</td> <td>1.44</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Inter-rater Transfer 1 (n=44)	Intra-rater Transfer 1 vs 2 (n=43)	Test-retest Transfer 1 vs 3 (n=29)	Total Score	0.830 †	0.687 #	0.721#	Wheelchair setup	0.962 *	0.717 #	0.695 #	Body setup	0.746 †	0.729 #	0.761 †	Flight/landing	0.829 †	0.854 †	0.836 †	TAI Score	Rater	Transfer 1					Average	SD	p-value	SEM	MDC	Total	In-person	7.56	1.01	0.021	0.44	1.23	Remote	7.70	1.05	Wheelchair Setup	In-person	6.73	2.14	0.631	0.42	1.15	Remote	6.77	2.10	Body Setup	In-person	7.69	1.44			
	Inter-rater Transfer 1 (n=44)	Intra-rater Transfer 1 vs 2 (n=43)	Test-retest Transfer 1 vs 3 (n=29)																																																												
Total Score	0.830 †	0.687 #	0.721#																																																												
Wheelchair setup	0.962 *	0.717 #	0.695 #																																																												
Body setup	0.746 †	0.729 #	0.761 †																																																												
Flight/landing	0.829 †	0.854 †	0.836 †																																																												
TAI Score	Rater	Transfer 1																																																													
		Average	SD	p-value	SEM	MDC																																																									
Total	In-person	7.56	1.01	0.021	0.44	1.23																																																									
	Remote	7.70	1.05																																																												
Wheelchair Setup	In-person	6.73	2.14	0.631	0.42	1.15																																																									
	Remote	6.77	2.10																																																												
Body Setup	In-person	7.69	1.44																																																												

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity		Reliability			Responsiveness Interpretability																																																															
		Remote	7.78	1.50	0.448	0.80	2.22																																																															
	Flight and Landing	In-person	8.83	2.14	0.005	0.88	2.44																																																															
		Remote	9.46	1.24																																																																		
<p>Note: In-person scores are represented as an average across all raters (n=4)</p> <p>Table 3. Percentage Agreement in item-level deficiencies between remote and in-person TAI scores for transfer 1</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Phase of Transfer</th> <th colspan="2" rowspan="2">Item</th> <th>Percentage Agreement Remote vs In-Person Raters</th> <th>Fleiss Kappa Across All Raters</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Average (Min - Max)</th> <th>Kappa [95% CI]</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Wheelchair Setup</td> <td>1</td> <td>Distance</td> <td>100%</td> <td>1.000 [0.926,1.093]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Angle</td> <td>100%</td> <td>1.000 [0.952,1.093]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Brakes</td> <td>100%</td> <td>1.000 [0.907,1.093]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Armrest</td> <td>97% (95100)</td> <td>0.954 [0.883,1.025]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Sideguard</td> <td>82% (8089)</td> <td>0.690 [0.614,0.767]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Level</td> <td>98% (98100)</td> <td>0.936 [0.842,1.031]</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Body Setup</td> <td>7</td> <td>Feet</td> <td>97% (95100)</td> <td>0.882 [0.812,0.952]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>Scoot</td> <td>84% (7791)</td> <td>0.527 [0.434,0.621]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>Trail Distance</td> <td>100%</td> <td>1.000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>Push Grip</td> <td>93% (8698)</td> <td>0.786 [0.706,0.865]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>Lead Grip</td> <td>94% (9198)</td> <td>0.715 [0.635,0.795]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>Lead Distance</td> <td>97% (9598)</td> <td>0.722 [0.617,0.804]</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>13</td> <td>Lean</td> <td>89% (7795)</td> <td>0.694 [0.501,0.688]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>									Phase of Transfer	Item		Percentage Agreement Remote vs In-Person Raters	Fleiss Kappa Across All Raters	Average (Min - Max)	Kappa [95% CI]	Wheelchair Setup	1	Distance	100%	1.000 [0.926,1.093]	2	Angle	100%	1.000 [0.952,1.093]	3	Brakes	100%	1.000 [0.907,1.093]	4	Armrest	97% (95100)	0.954 [0.883,1.025]	5	Sideguard	82% (8089)	0.690 [0.614,0.767]	6	Level	98% (98100)	0.936 [0.842,1.031]	Body Setup	7	Feet	97% (95100)	0.882 [0.812,0.952]	8	Scoot	84% (7791)	0.527 [0.434,0.621]	9	Trail Distance	100%	1.000	10	Push Grip	93% (8698)	0.786 [0.706,0.865]	11	Lead Grip	94% (9198)	0.715 [0.635,0.795]	12	Lead Distance	97% (9598)	0.722 [0.617,0.804]		13	Lean	89% (7795)	0.694 [0.501,0.688]
Phase of Transfer	Item		Percentage Agreement Remote vs In-Person Raters	Fleiss Kappa Across All Raters																																																																		
			Average (Min - Max)	Kappa [95% CI]																																																																		
Wheelchair Setup	1	Distance	100%	1.000 [0.926,1.093]																																																																		
	2	Angle	100%	1.000 [0.952,1.093]																																																																		
	3	Brakes	100%	1.000 [0.907,1.093]																																																																		
	4	Armrest	97% (95100)	0.954 [0.883,1.025]																																																																		
	5	Sideguard	82% (8089)	0.690 [0.614,0.767]																																																																		
	6	Level	98% (98100)	0.936 [0.842,1.031]																																																																		
Body Setup	7	Feet	97% (95100)	0.882 [0.812,0.952]																																																																		
	8	Scoot	84% (7791)	0.527 [0.434,0.621]																																																																		
	9	Trail Distance	100%	1.000																																																																		
	10	Push Grip	93% (8698)	0.786 [0.706,0.865]																																																																		
	11	Lead Grip	94% (9198)	0.715 [0.635,0.795]																																																																		
	12	Lead Distance	97% (9598)	0.722 [0.617,0.804]																																																																		
	13	Lean	89% (7795)	0.694 [0.501,0.688]																																																																		

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample		Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
	Flight / Landing	14 15	Between Surfaces Landing	98% (98100) 97% (95100)	0.933 [0.839,1.026] 0.710 [0.617,0.804]
<p>Note: Item-level deficiencies are defined as scores <1 Percentage agreement with in-person raters presented as the average across raters for remote vs in-person as well as the minimum and maximum</p>					
<p>Worobey et al. 2020</p> <p>Study to evaluate the psychometric properties of the TAI-Q</p> <p>2017 National Veterans Wheelchair Games, Cincinnati, OH</p>	<p>N = 44 wheelchair users 35M, 9F Mean (SD) age 56.5 (12.7) years Diagnostic category: Paraplegia (n = 20), tetraplegia (n = 2), SCI unspecified (n = 8), other neurologic diseases (n = 14) Mean (SD) time since injury 17.4 (11.4) years</p>		<p>Concurrent validity: Agreement between the TAI and TAI-Q was poor-to-moderate for session 1 but improved to moderate-to-acceptable after video review and to acceptable-to-strong for session 2. See table 1.</p>	<p>After video review of their transfer, acceptable levels of reliability were demonstrated for total TAI-Q score for intrarater (intraclass correlation [ICC], 0.627) and test-retest reliability (ICC, 0.705). See table 1.</p>	<p>SEM and MDC: The SEMs were 0.80, 0.71, and 0.59 for session 1 pre-video review, session 1 post-video review, and session 2, respectively. The MDCs were 2.21, 1.97, and 1.63 for session 1 pre-video review, session 1 post-video review, and session 2, respectively.</p>
<p>Table 1. Concurrent validity with the TAI and intrarater and test-retest reliability for the TAI-Q total and subscores</p>					
Score		Concurrent Validity (TAI-Q vs TAI)		Intrarater (TAI-Q)	Test-retest (TAI-Q)

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample		Validity		Reliability		Responsiveness Interpretability	
		Session 1 Pre- video	Session 1 Post-video	Session 2 Post-video	Session 1 Post- video vs Session 2 Post-video	Session 1 Post- Video vs Session 3 Post-video		
	Total score	0.411*	0.554*	0.740 ^y	0.627 ^y	0.705 ^y		
	Wheelchair setup	0.508*	0.604 ^y	0.657 ^y	0.643 ^y	0.668 ^y		
	Body setup	0.457*	0.676 ^y	0.836 ^z	0.775 ^y	0.549*		
	Flight/landing	0.289	0.495*	0.669 ^y	0.533*	0.380		
<p>NOTE. Session 1 is the only session self-scoring completed before video review. In the remainder of sessions, all self-scoring was completed after video review.</p> <p>* Moderate reliability. † Acceptable reliability. ‡ Strong reliability.</p>								
Worobey et al. 2018 Repeated measures Evaluation of TAI Version 4.0 2017 National Veterans Wheelchair	n=44 full-time wheelchair users 35 male, 9 female Mean age (SD) = 56.5 (12.7) Diagnosis: SCI = 30; MS = 1; Transverse myelitis = 1; Amputation = 5; Guillain-Barré = 1; Stroke = 1		Concurrent Validity: (across all transfers) Mean TAI 4.0 (SD) = 7.58 ± 1.12 Mean VAS (SD) = 7.44 ± 1.78 (r = 0.52-0.7)		Test-retest, Inter- rater, Intra-rater: Inter-rater reliability (ICC): Total TAI 4.0: Session 1 = .80; Session 2 = .85 Intra-rater reliability (ICC) session 1 vs. 2: Total TAI 4.0:		Responsiveness: TAI 4.0 SEM: Session 1 = 0.24; Session 2 = 0.23 TAI 4.0 MDC: Session 1 = 0.68; Session 2 = 0.63	

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
Games in Cincinnati, OH.	<p>Time since injury/diagnosis (SD): 17.4 (11.4)</p> <p>Type of wheelchair (%) Manual wheelchair = 75; Power wheelchair = 25</p> <p>Inclusion criteria: Participants could independently transfer to/from a wheelchair surface within 30 seconds.</p>		<p>Rater 1 = .69; Rater 2 = .76; Rater 3 = .60; Rater 4 = 0.71</p> <p>Test-retest reliability (ICC) session 1 vs. 3: Total TAI 4.0: Rater 1 = .70; Rater 2 = .76; Rater 3 = .55; Rater 4 = 0.60</p>	
<p>Baghel et al. 2018</p> <p>Repeated measures Evaluation of TAI Version 3.0</p> <p>Rehabilitation department of Indian spinal</p>	<p>n=30 first-time manual wheelchair users</p> <p>25 male, 5 female Mean age (SD) = 31.9 (12.3)</p> <p>Injury level: 6 tetraplegia; 5 high paraplegia (T2-T7); 19 low paraplegia (T8-L4)</p>	<p>Pearson Correlations: (p=0.001)</p> <p>Rater 1 = 0.89 Rater 2 = 0.89 Rater 3 = 0.88 Rater 4 = 0.90</p>	<p>Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater:</p> <p>Inter-rater reliability (ICC): TAI 3.0</p> <p>Part 1: Session 1 = .671; Session 2 = .697</p> <p>Part 2: Session 1 = .516; Session 2 = .511</p>	<p>Responsiveness:</p> <p>MDC: Interrater Time 1= 0.47 Interrater Time 2= 0.44</p> <p>Intrarater Total 1= 0.64 Intrarater Total 2= 0.40 Intrarater Total 3= 0.86</p>

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
injuries center, New Delhi.	ASIA: A=11; B=11; C=5; D=3 Duration (months) of SCI (SD): 1.33 (0.47) Type of transfer (%) Independent sitting pivot = 66.7 Assisted sitting pivot = 33.3 Inclusion criteria: Participants were able to sit with/without hand support for 30s.		Intra-rater reliability (ICC): TAI Part 1 = 0.93-0.95 TAI Part 2 = 0.97-0.98	Intrarater Total 4= 0.78 SEM: Interrater Time 1= 0.17 Interrater Time 2= 0.16 Intrarater Total 1= 0.23 Intrarater Total 2= 0.23 Intrarater Total 3= 0.23 Intrarater Total 4= 0.28
McClure et al. 2011 Repeated measures 2009 National Veterans Wheelchair Games in Spokane, WA.	n=40 full-time wheelchair users 34 male, 6 female Mean age (SD) = 51.7 (11.3) Diagnoses: SCI = 32; MS = 4; TBI = 1; Amputation = 2; Guillain-Barré = 1 Time since SCI (n=31) = 16.9 (10.7)	Concurrent Validity: An independent therapist rated the study participants on a global rating scale to assess the overall quality of the transfer. Spearman rank correlation coefficients were calculated for each	Test-retest, Intra- rater, Inter-rater: Inter-rater reliability (ICC): Part 1: Session 1 = .98; Session 2 = .99 Part 2: Session 1 = .99; Session 2 = .99 Total score:	Floor/ceiling effect: Three items (items 9 and 15 in part 1 and item 7 in part 2) had a potential ceiling effect. Interpretability: Item breakdown of mean (SD) scores for the TAI is available in

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
	<p>Method of transfer: Sitting pivot = 30; Standing pivot=10</p> <p>Type of wheelchair (%) Manual wheelchair=28; Power wheelchair = 11</p> <p>Type of transfer (%) Independent=33; Human-assisted=7</p>	<p>rater to evaluate the correlation of the TAI scores (total) with a global assessment of transfer skills.</p> <p>Correlations: Rater 1 = .279 (p=.116) Rater 2 = .192 (p=.285) Rater 3 = .690 (p.000)*</p> <p>Study participants reported that the assessment was not difficult and they did not feel uncomfortable with any of the transfers the evaluators asked them to do.</p>	<p>Session 1 = .99; Session 2 = .99</p> <p>Intra-rater reliability (ICC): Part 1: Rater 1 = .634; Rater 2 = .34; Rater 3 = .804 Part 2: Rater 1 = .724; Rater 2 = .35; Rater 3 = .875 Total score: Rater 1 = .741; Rater 2 = .35; Rater 3 = .893</p>	<p>Table 2 of McClure et al. 2011.</p>
<p>Tsai et al. 2013</p> <p>Repeated measures</p>	<p>n=41 wheelchair users 31 male, 10 female Mean age (SD) = 49.9 (12.7)</p>	<p>In version 3.0, 2 items were removed due to low intra-rater reliability and clinician feedback. 13 items were reworded to</p>	<p>Test-retest, Intra-rater, Inter-rater: Inter-rater reliability (ICC): Part 1:</p>	<p>Responsiveness: See table 1.</p> <p>Interpretability: Item breakdown of</p>

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
<p>Evaluation of TAI Version 3.0</p> <p>A winter sports clinic for disabled veterans.</p>	<p>Type of disability: Tetraplegia=8; High paraplegia (T2-7)=7; Low paraplegia (T8 to L4)=14; Multiple sclerosis & brain injury=7; LMN injuries & amputee=5</p> <p>Type of transfer: Sitting pivot=36; Standing pivot=3; Dependent without lift=1; Device assisted=1</p> <p>Length of wheelchair use, years (n=40) = 9.9 (9.0)</p> <p>No. of transfers per day (n=40) = 12.3 (7.4)</p>	<p>clarify meaning and remove ambiguity. A revised comprehensive clinician training program was also developed.</p> <p>There were no significant differences in final TAI scores among subgroups of people with tetraplegia, high paraplegia, and low paraplegia ($F_{2,26}=1.66$, $P=.21$) or among the BMI categories ($F_{3,35}=1.24$, $P=.31$). There was no significant difference in TAI scores between men and women ($t_{39}=.22$, $P=.83$).</p>	<p>Session 1 = .85; Session 2 = .82</p> <p>Part 2: Session 1 = .81; Session 2 = .84</p> <p>Total score: Session 1 = .85; Session 2 = .84</p> <p>Intra-rater reliability (ICC): Part 1: Rater 1 = .87; Rater 2 = .77; Rater 3 = .79</p> <p>Part 2: Rater 1 = .83; Rater 2 = .74; Rater 3 = .81</p> <p>Total score: Rater 1 = .78; Rater 2 = .84; Rater 3 = .88</p>	<p>mean (SD) scores for the TAI is available in Table 2 of Tsai et al. 2013.</p>
<p>Table 1.</p>				

Author Year Research Design Setting (country)	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample		Validity		Reliability		Responsiveness Interpretability		
		TAI 3.0 Intrarat er SEM	TAI 2.0 Intrarat er SEM	TAI 3.0 Interrat er SEM	TAI 2.0 Interrat er SEM	TAI 3.0 Intrarat er MDC	TAI 2.0 Intrarat er MDC	TAI 3.0 Interrat er MDC	TAI 2.0 Interrat er MDC
	Part 1 score	.61	.50	.59	.45	1.68	1.38	1.64	1.25
	Part 2 score	.71	.60	.68	.75	1.96	1.66	1.87	2.07
	Final score	.56	.50	.55	.54	1.55	1.38	1.53	1.51