

Appendix 3. Table displaying the evaluated Psychometric Properties of all measures included in the systematic review

Author and year	content validity	internal consistency	criterion validity	construct validity	reproducibility		responsiveness	floor and ceiling	interpretability
					agreement	reliability			
Alewijnse 2003 <sup>51</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?
Alexandre 2002 <sup>15</sup>	-	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Barnowski 1998 <sup>62</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?
Bassett 2011 <sup>16</sup>	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	?
Bennell 2012 <sup>17</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Borello-France 2008 <sup>53</sup>	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Borello-France 2010 <sup>52</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brovold 2012 <sup>58</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chen 1999 <sup>18</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Chen 2009 <sup>54</sup>	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cockram 2006 <sup>47</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Courneya 2004 <sup>13</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Dobkin 2008 <sup>19</sup>									
GAS	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	?
SAS	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?
Donesky-Cuenco 2007 <sup>48</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?

Duncan 2002 <sup>38</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ettinger 1997 <sup>20</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evangelista 2001 <sup>39</sup>	+	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Forkan 2006 <sup>59</sup>	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fukuoka 2011 <sup>67</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Gallo 1997 <sup>55</sup>	?	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0
Gary 2011 <sup>40</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
Hardage 2007 <sup>60</sup>									
AESOP	+	0	?	-	0	?	0	-	0
Monthly calendars	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard 2008 <sup>21</sup>	?	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?
Jurkiewicz 2011 <sup>41</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
Khalil 2012 <sup>50</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Telephone questionnaire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Log	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kim 2006 <sup>56</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
King 1991 <sup>68</sup>	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?
King 2012 <sup>42</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Levy 2008 <sup>22</sup>	0	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	?
Levy 2008 <sup>23</sup>	0	?	0	-	0	0	0	0	?

Lyngcoln 2005 <sup>63</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Lysack 2005 <sup>64</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0
Mailloux 2006 <sup>24</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
Mannion 2009 <sup>25</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Marzolini 2010 <sup>43</sup>	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
McCarthy 2004 <sup>26</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medina-Mirapeix 2009 <sup>27</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michener 2001 <sup>28</sup>	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milne 2005 <sup>29</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mori 2006 <sup>57</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Oka 2000 <sup>44</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pickett 2002 <sup>14</sup>	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rackwitz 2007 <sup>30</sup>	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radtke 1989 <sup>45</sup>	-	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
Roddey 2002 <sup>31</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
Saez 2004 <sup>32</sup>	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salo 2012 <sup>33</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schoo 2005 <sup>34</sup>	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?

Sluijs 1993 <sup>35</sup>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?
Spink 2012 <sup>61</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Steinhilber 2012 <sup>36</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terpstra 1992 <sup>37</sup>	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tooth 1993 <sup>46</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
van Leer 2012 <sup>66</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wang 2012 <sup>69</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White 2007 <sup>49</sup>	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wilbur 2001 <sup>70</sup>	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zagarins 2011 <sup>65</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Key**

The criteria the construct needed to obtain to get a certain rating varied greatly as each aspect was different. Therefore please see<sup>15</sup> for the criteria needed for each construct for the different ratings.

+ = A positive rating where the paper and measure have addressed each of the criteria for a positive rating to a satisfactory extent

? = An intermediate rating where the paper and measure have possibly completed some of the aspects needed for a positive rating, but not all of the required aspects or the method or design used is doubtful

- = A negative where the aspect being measured proved to be non-existent or fall below specified thresholds despite the method and design used were sufficient

0 = A 0 was accredited when there was no information in the paper or evident in the measure that this aspect had been considered.