**SDC 2 overview of categorization outcome measures**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Intervention type** **Study** | **Primary outcome measures (FUNCTION=Red, PARTICIPATION=Green, QOL=Blue)** | **Secondary outcome measures (FUNCTION=Red, PARTICIPATION=Green, QOL=Blue)** | **Outcome measure for meta-analysis** | **Comments**  |
| **Holistic interventions** |   |   |   |   |
| Behn et al., 2018 | The Adapted Measure of Participation in Conversation, The Satisfaction with Life Scale  | The Adapted Measure of Support in Conversation, The Impression Scales, La Trobe Communication Questionnaire, Goal Attainment Scaling, The Quality of life in Brain Injury  | Function: NA data forest plot (the impression scale entails 4 subscale, but no total score). Participation: The Adapted Measure of Participation in Conversation (interaction) QOL: The Satisfaction with Life Scale  | Choose the The Adapted Measure of Participation in Conversation (MPC) Interaction, because most related to participation (interaction).  |
| Bell et al., 2005 | Composite outcome of; The Functional Independence Measure, Disability Rating Scale, Community Integration Questionnaire, Neurobehavioral Functioning Inventory, Functional Status Examination, Glascow Outcome Scale-Extended, Medical Outcome Study 36-Item Short -Form Health Survey, Brief Symptom Inventory, EuroQol, Modified Perceived Quality of Life Scale | TIme to return to work, hours of paid employment, income, the monthly employment ratio, and the work domain of the FSE  | NA | No information SD |
| Bell et al., 2011 | Composite outcome of; The Functional Independence Measure, Disability Rating Scale, Participation with Recombined Tools-Objective, Glascow Outcome Scale-Extended, The Short Form-12 Health Survey, Brief Symptom Inventory-18, EuroQol, Modified Perceived Quality of Life Scale. |  Measures of vocational status; time from injury to return to work, weeks of competitive employment during the past year, and average hours per week worked during the past month.  | NA | No information SD |
| Grill et al., 2007 | Functional Independence Measure, and days spent in the acute hospital after discharge from rehabilitation.  | Survival after discharge, measured within second year after discharge  | NA | point estimate Cicerone = 0 |
| Hanks et al., 2012 | Community Integration Measure, Coping Inventory for Stressful Situations, General functioning and behavior control scales from the Family Assessment Device, physical functioning component from Medical Outcomes Study 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey, Brief Symptom Inventory-18, The Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test. |  | NA | point estimate Cicerone = 0 |
| Hartman-Maeir et al., 2004 | The Functional Independence Measure, The Lawton Instrumental Activities of Daily Living, The Activity Card Sort, The Life-Satisfaction Questionnaire, The Stroke Impact Scale |  | NA | point estimate Cicerone = 0 |
| Mayo et al., 2015 | Community Healthy Activities ModelProgram for Seniors questionnaire, Reintegration to Normal Living Index, gait speed ms, Stroke-Specific Geriatric DepressionScale, Apathy Scale | EuroQuol EQ-5D, Preference-Based Stroke Index. | Function: Community Healthy Activities ModelProgram for Seniors questionnaire. Participation: Reintegration to Normal Living Index. QOL: EuroQuol EQ-5D  | Choose EuroQuol EQ-5D because most common and frequently applied. Choose Commmuinty HAMP because most generic. |
| Ownsworth et al., 2008 | Canadian Occupational Performance Measure; Patient Competency Rating Scale, 3 subscales from The Brain Injury Community Rehabilitation Outcome 39  |  | Function: Canadian Occupational Performance Measure (performance scale). Participation: psychological well-being subscale from The Brain Injury Community Rehabilitation Outcome 39. QOL: NA | Choose COPM because most common and frequently applied. Choose COPM performance scale. Choose the BICRO-39 psychological well-being subscale.  |
| Ownsworth et al., 2015 |  McGill Quality of Life Questionnaire, Montgomery–Asberg Depression Rating Scale, Depression Anxiety Stress Scales—21, The Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Brain  |  | Function: MADRS Participation: NA QOL: McGill Quality of Life Questionnaire  | Choose MADRS because most common and frequently applied. |
| Powell et al., 2002 | The unmodified Barthel Index, The Brain Injury Community Rehabilitation Outcome 39 Scales  | The Functional Independence/Assessment Measure, The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale  |  Function: Barthel index. Participation: The Brain Injury Community Rehabilitation Outcome 39Scales. QOL: NA  | Results reported in median (range) |
| Rotenberg-Shpigelman et al. 2012 | Canadian Occupational Performance Measure, Goal Attainment Scaling. | Stroke Impact Scale | Function: Canadian Occupational Performance Measure (performance scale). Participation: NA data forest plot (Stroke impact Scale). QOL: NA | Choose COPM performance scale for results to include forest plot, not the satisfaction scale). Stroke impact scale - no mean score between groups described. Only data for within effects.  |
| Trexler et al., 2016 | The Vocational Independence Scale, time to return to work, and the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory 4 Participation Index  | The Global Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory-18  | NA | Data missing |
| Wang et al. 2015 | Stroke Impact Scale, Berg Balance Scale, 10-Meter Walk Test, 6-Minute Walk Test, and Barthel Index, Caregiver Burden  |   | Function: Barthel Index Participation: Stroke Impact Scale composite score social participation. QoL: Stroke Impact Scale composite score general recovery). | Choose the Barthel Index because most common and frequently applied. For participation outcome, choose SIS composite score for social participation. For QoL outcome, choose Stroke Impact Scale comopsite genereal recovery. |
| Winter et al., 2016 | The Community Re-integrationfor Service Members scale, Target Outcome, The Patient Competency Rating Scale.  |   | Function: The Patient Competency Rating Scale Participation: The Community Re-integrationfor Service Members scale. QOL: NA | Choose PCRS because most common and frequenly applied |
| **Physical interventions** |   |   |   |   |
| Arkan et al., 2018 | The Incontinence Quality of life Scale, The international Incontinence Questionnaire Short form, Bladder diary, 24-hour pad test, Broome Pellvic Floor Muscle Exercise Self-efficacy Scale, The Burden Interview  |  | Function: 24-hour Pad test: Participation: NA. QoL: The Incontinence Quality of life Scale | Choose The Incontinence Quality of life Scale because most QOL oriented. Choose Pad test because most related for function. |
| Aydin et al., 2016  | The functional independence measure, FIM |  | Function: FIM. Participation: NA QOL: NA |  |
| Barzel et al., 2015 | Motor Activity Log and Wolf Motor Function Test |  Subdomain of the Stroke Impact Scale for hand function, Nine Hole Peg Test, Barthel Index, and instrumental activities of daily living. | Function: Motor Activity Log (quality of movement). Participation: NA. QOL: NA | Choose Motor Activity Log because most frequently applied  |
| Bellon et al., 2014 | Centre for Epidemiological Studies-Depression, Perceived Stress Scale. |   | Function: Perceived Stress Scale  | Choose Perceived Stress Scale because equally more N included |
| Brouwer et al., 2018 | Subjective Indexof Physical and Social Outcome | The Timed Up and Go, 6-minute walk test, Stair ascent/decend Test, Medical Outcomes Survey 36-item Short-Form Health Survey, Berg Balance Scale | Function: 6-minute walk test. Participation: Subjective Indexof Physical and Social Outcome. QOL: Medical Outcomes Survey 36-item Short-Form Health Survey -physical comp. summary score | Choose 6-minute walk test because very well validated and correlates with a borad range of functions. Regarding SF -36, both physical and mental summary score reported. Choose physical summary score, as reported in the result of authors and also more relevant to aim  |
| Chan &Tsang, 2018 | Auditory Stroop test, Turning-while-walking task, Combined Dual-tasking  |  | Function: Turning-while-walking dual task (completion time). Participation: NA. QOL: NA. |  |
| Chen et al. 2020 | The Fugl-Meyer assessment of spasticity measurement; The Modified Ashworth scale; The 10-Meter Walk Test, The Barthel Index  |  | Function: The Barthel Index. Participation: NA. QOL: NA | Choose Barthel Index because widely used |
| Clanchy et al., 2016 | Daily motion counts per minute and minutes of moderate-to-vigorous-intensity in physical activity | Self-efficacy (Marcus et als Exercise self-efficacy questionnaire), social support (Sallis et als social support scale), Decisional Balance (Marcus et als pros and cons of behavioral change) | Function: Daily motion counts per minute (Daily motion counts per minute. Participation: NA. QOL: NA | Choose Daily Motion Counts per minute because most related to study aims aims.  |
| Donnelly et al., 2017 | Adapted version of the Quality-of-Life After Brain Injury instrument |  | Function: NA. Participation: NA. QOL: QOLIBRI |  |
| Gordon et al., 2013 | Physical and Mental Component Summary scores of the Medical Outcomes Survey 36-Item Short Form Health Survey, the Barthel Index, the instrumental activities of daily living dimension of the Older Americans Resources and Services Questionnaire. |  6-minute walk test, resting heart rate, and Motricity Index/lower limb strength. |  Function: the Barthel Index. Participation: NA. QOL: Physical Summary scores of the Medical Outcomes Survey 36-Item Short Form Health Survey | Choose the Barthel Index because most common and frequently applied. Regarding SF -36, both physical and mental summary score reported. Choose physical summary score, as more relevant to aim  |
| Graef et al., 2016 | The Upper-Extremity Performance Test by Test d’Évaluation des Membres Supérieurs des Personnes Âgées - TEMPA | Grip strength as measured by dynamometer, shoulder strength as measured by load cell, active shoulder flexion as measured by standard goniometry, Fugl-Meyer Upper-extremity assessment scale, Modified Ashworth scale | Function: The Upper-Extremity Performance Test by Test d’Évaluation des Membres Supérieurs des Personnes Âgées - TEMPA. Participation: NA. QOL: NA |  |
| Hesse et al., 2011 | Rivermead Mobility Index | Rivermead Motor Assessment, section leg and trunk, Rivermead Motor Assessment, arm section, walking velocity m/s, 10m test, Stair climbing velocity steps/min, Time up and go test, Lower limb spasticity according to modified Ashworth score, Rivermead Activities of Daily Living scales. | Function: Rivermead Mobility Index. Participation: NA. QOL: NA |  |
| Hoffman et al., 2010 | Beck Depression Inventory  | the Brief Pain Inventory, Pittsburgh Sleep Inventory, Head Injury Symptom checklist, the Short Form-12 Health Survey, the Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique Short Form, the Perceived Quality of Life, a 6-minute walking test. | NA | point estimate Cicerone = 0 |
| Huijgen et al., 2008 | Action Research Arm Test and the Nine Hole Peg Test. |  | Function: the Nine Hole Peg Test. Participation: NA. QOL: NA | Choose the Nine Hole Peg Test because most recognized. |
| Jeong et al., 2007 | Range of motion as measured by goniometer, shoulder flexibility as measured by Back-scratch test, The Profile of Mood States instrument, The Relationship Change Scale, the Stroke Specific Quality of Life scale |  | Function: Range of motion as measured by goniometer Participation: NA. QOL: the Stroke Specific Quality of Life scale | Choose Range of Motion as measured by goniometer because most standardized and global for shoulder function. |
| Lima et al., 2014 | Motor Activity Log Brazil scores  | Wolf Motor Function Test, The bilateral Ativity Assessment Scale, Isometric strength measured with technical equipment for grip, pinch and for the paretic arm; shoulder flexors, elbow flexors/extensors, and wrist extensors, Brazilian version of the Stroke Specific Quality of Life, Reach-to-grasp kinematics was evaluated by the three-dimensional Qualisys Pro-Reflex-MCU 240. | Function: Motor Activity Log ((MAL amount of use)). Participation: NA. QOL: Brazilian version of the Stroke Specific Quality of Life (total score). |  |
| Llorens et al., 2015 | Berg Balance Scale  | Performance-Oriented Mobility Assessment balance subscale, Performance-Oriented Mobility Assessment gait subscale, Brunel Balance Assessment. | Function: Berg Balance Scale. Participation: NA. QOL: NA |  |
| Pang et al., 2005 | Cardiorespiratory fitness measured by VO2max, The 6-minute walk test, Berg Balance Scale, Isometric knee extension strength measured by handheld dynamometer, Physical Activity Scale for Individuals with Physical Disabilities, bilateral hip scan measured by dual-energy x-ray, Femoral neck bone mineral density measured in g/cm2. |   | Function: The 6-minute walk test. Participation: NA. QOL: NA. | Choose 6-minute walk test because very well validated and frequently applied. |
| Patterson et al., 2010 | Home Functioning Questionnaire, EQ-5D  |  | NA | point estimate Cicerone = 0 |
| Piron et al., 2009 | The Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity,the ABILHAND, and the Ashworth scales. |  | Function: The Fugl-Meyer Upper Extremity. Participation: NA. QOL: NA |  |
| Stuart et al., 2019 | 6 Minutes Walking Test  | Berg Balance Scale; the Short Physical Performance Battery; the 30-foot timed walk; and the Stroke Impact Scale | NA |  |
| Xie et al., 2018 | Berg Balance Scale  | Single Leg Stance Test, Fugl-Meyer Assessment, Time up to go test, Modified Barthel Index, Modified Falls Efficacy Scale, Medical Outcomes SF-36, Beck Depression Inventory  | NA | Low data quality |
| Yoo et al., 2011 | Wolf Motor Function Test, Motor ActivityLog, and Stroke Short Form – Quality of Life assessment  |   | Function: Motor ActivityLog (MAL amount of use) . Participation: NA. QOL: NA data forest plot | Choose Motor Activity Log because most frequently applied and use MAL amount of use. Regarding Stroke Short form forQoL, authors only report subscores for the 12 subscales.  |
| **Specific interventions** |   |   |   |   |
| Bèdard et al., 2014 | Beck Depression Inventory-II  | Patient Health Quastionnaire-9, SCL-90R, Philadelphia Mindfulness Scale, Toronto Mindfulness Scale. | Function: Beck Depression Inventory-II. Participation: NA QOL: NA | Choose the primary outcome measure  |
| Bourgeois et al., 2007 | Frequency of reported problems documented in memory Log  | Goal Mastery maintanance/generalization, Cognitive Difficulties Questionnaire, Community Integration Questionnaire  |  Function: Frequency of reported problems documented in memory Log. Participation: Community Integration Questionnaire QOL: NA |  |
| Brown et al., 2015 | Advocacy Behaviour Rating Scale  |  | Function: Advocacy Behaviour Rating Scale Video. Participation: NA. QOL: NA. | Choose the ABRS video as measurement, not letter subscale, as video subscale includes both verbal and behavioral performance. |
| Carnevale et al., 2006 | Frequency of target problem behaviors  | Subscales (3) from the Question-naire on Resources and Stress for Families with Chronically Ill or Handicapped Members, Maslach Burnout Inventory, The Neurobehavioral Functioning Inventory–Revised. | NA | point estimate Cicerone = 0 |
| Das Nair & Lincoln, 2012 | Everyday Memory Questionnaire  | Rivermead Behavioural Memory Test -extended, General Health Questionnaire -12, Nottingham Extended Activities and Daily Living Scale, The Internal and External Memory Aids Questionnaire, Wimbledon Self Report Scale, Mental Adjustment to Brain Damage |  Function: Everyday Memory Questionnaire. Participation: NA. QOL: NA. | Choose the primary outcome measure  |
| Efstratiadou et al., 2019 | Oral confrontation naming task of the 260 Snodgrass and Vanderwart pictures – colour version  | Boston Naming Test; the American Speech and Hearing Association Functional Assessment of Communication Skills for Adults; the Cookie Theft Picture Description of the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination; correct information units per min.; General Health Questionnaire-12; the Stroke and Aphasia Quality of Life Scale; EQ-5D. | NA | Sample size not provided. |
| Fann et al., 2015 | Hamilton Depression Rating Scale, Symptom Checklist-20  | Criteria for major depression disorder based on the SCID, Patient Global Impression, Satisfaction with Depression Care, The MOS 36-item short-form health survey, Sheehan Disability Scale, Head Injury Symptom Checklist | Function: Hamilton Depression Rating Scale. Participation: NA. QOL: NA | Choose Hamilton Depression Rating Scale because most related to depression  |
| Heinemann et al., 2004 | The Addiction Severity Index, The Community Integration Questionnaire, The Satisfaction with Life Scale, The Family Satisfaction Scale, The Short-Form Health Survey-36, Employment status |  | NA  | NA sample sixe not reported |
| Meltzer et al., 2017 | Western Aphasia Battery-Revised, Part 1, for aphasia participants, Cognitive- Linguistic Quick Test, for cog-ling participants | Communication Confidence Rating Scale for Aphasia, Communication Effectiveness Index  | Function: Western Aphasia Battery-Revised, Part 1, for aphasia participants (NA forest plot) Participation: NA. QOL: NA | Only data for aphasia group. Four subscales reported for the Western Aphasia Battery, so results cannot be used in forest plot.  |
| Raina et al., 2016 | Feasibility measures (not measuring efffectiveness, such as study recruitment) | Modified Fatigue Impact Scale, the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Fatigue Scale, the Fatigue Severity Scale. | Function: The Fatigue Severity Scale. Participation: NA QOL: NA | Choose The Fatigue Severity Scale because most common and frequently used. |
| Rietdijk et al., 2020 | Adapted Measure of Support in Conversation (MSC) Reveal Competence scale applied to the casual conversation samples | MSC Acknowledge Competence scale for casual and purposeful conversations; Adapted Measure of Participation in Conversation (MPC) Acknowledge Competence scale for casual and purposeful conversations; MPC Interaction scale for casual and purposeful conversations; MPC Transaction scale for casual and purposeful conversations. | NA | Data not provided separate groups. |
| Woolf et al., 2016 | Spoken picture naming test | Quantifed word retrieval during conversation applying POWERS procedure  | Function:Spoken picture naming test (NA forest plot) Participation: NA. QOL: NA. | Data not merged for the intervention participants receiving video conference and home-based. Thus, data reported on too small sample size (4 and 5 participants each group).  |