Last updated: December 31st, 2024

## Research Summary – Activities-Specific Balance Confidence (ABC) Scale – Balance

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
Shah et al. 2017  Prospective, cross-sectional study to evaluate the test-retest reliability, convergent validity, and discriminative validity of the Activities-specific Balance Confidence (ABC) scale in individuals with incomplete SCI  Laboratory; Saskatchewan, Canada	N = 26 participants with SCI 20M, 6F Mean (SD) age 59.7 (18.9) years AIS C (n = 5), AIS D (n = 21) Level of injury: C1-L4  N = 26 participants without SCI 20M, 6F Mean (SD) age 58.9 (18.1) years	The correlation between ABC scale scores and:  MiniBESTest:  Total MiniBESTest score: ρ=0.76, P<0.001  MiniBESTest subscores: ρ=0.60-0.69, P≤0.001  To-MWT:  Fast 10-MWT:  Fast 10-MWT: r=0.80, P<0.001  Self-selected 10-MWT: r=0.706, P<0.001  Lower extremity strength: ρ=0.60, P=0.001  Sensory function:  Proprioception: ρ=0.26, P=0.199  Cutaneous pressure: ρ=0.08, P=0.704	Test-retest reliability (n = 23): ICC = 0.93, 95% CI = 0.85–0.97.	The SEM of the ABC scale was calculated to be 5.37% (using s <sub>x</sub> =20.28% and r <sub>x</sub> =0.93). The MDC <sub>95</sub> was calculated to be 14.87%.

Last updated: December 31st, 2024

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		<ul> <li>All SCI-FAP task scores: ρ=-0.67 to -0.76, P≤0.001).</li> <li>Two biomechanical measures showed a significant correlation with the ABC scale: Total center of pressure velocity (ρ=-0.69, P&lt;0.001) and center of pressure in the anterior-posterior direction (ρ=-0.71, P&lt;0.001). As ABC scale score increased, the velocity of the center of pressure decreased.</li> </ul>		
		Discriminative validity: On average, participants with incomplete SCI scored significantly lower on the ABC scale than their age- and sexmatched peers without SCI (67.5±20.3% (range 21.3–95.3%) versus 94.5±7.3% (range 65.6–100%), Z=-4.381, P<0.001).		

Last updated: December 31st, 2024

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		The ROC analysis showed an AUC of 0.95 (95% CI = 0.89–1.00).		
Diang et al. 2022  Psychometric study to test the reliability and validity of the Composite Activity-related Risk of Falls Scale (CARFS)  China	<ul> <li>N = 136</li> <li>70 older adults (mean age: 68.0 years; 35M, 35F)</li> <li>38 persons with stroke</li> <li>18 persons with SCI (Mean age: 48.5 years; 13M, 5F; 10 quadriplegia and 8 paraplegia).</li> </ul>	Convergent validity:  Overall CARF score was significantly correlated with the average ABC score in each participant group:  Elderly: rho = -0.824, p < 0.01  Stroke: rho = -0.761, p < 0.01  SCI: rho = -0.601, p < 0.01  The average ABC score showed weak to moderate correlation with the walking independence levels (Functional Assessment Measure) in each group [rho= 0.603, 0.331, and 0.325 for elderly (p < 0.01), stroke (p < 0.05), and SCI groups,		

Last updated: December 31st, 2024

Author Year Country Research Design Setting	Demographics and Injury Characteristics of Sample	Validity	Reliability	Responsiveness Interpretability
		respectively (p > 0.05)].  • The average ABC showed moderate correlation with number of previous falls only in the group with stroke (rho= 0.430, p < 0.05)		