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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID Year</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Population (sample size, age) and Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dijkers 1999   | Survey; follow-up study | National SCI database | N=2183 (1766M, 417F)  
# participants in each age range:  
0-19: N=412  
20-29: N=802  
30-39: N=444  
40-49: N=268  
50-59: N=142  
>60: N=115  
  Records from the National SCI database, containing entries since 1973. |
| Geyh et al. 2010 | Cross-sectional multi-centre study | Out-patients with SCI from study centers in Australia, Brazil, Canada, Israel, South Africa, and the US | N=243  
Mean age=41.4 ± 13.6  
% male = 79.4  
% female = 20.6  
Mean time since onset = 139.6±138.8 months  
SCI  
% paraplegia = 45.7  
% tetraplegia = 54.3  
Completeness of injury (AIS)  
% complete (A) = 47.7  
% incomplete (B-D) = 43.6  
% unspecified = 8.6 |
| Hitzig et al. 2012 | Cross-sectional telephone survey | Rehabilitation institute | N=618  
(M=501; F=117)  
Mean age = 49.2y (18-92)  
Mean YPI = 16.3y (1-60)  
Community-dwelling SCI patients who were at least 1 year postinjury.  
Incomplete tetraplegia = 203  
Complete tetraplegia = 102  
Incomplete paraplegia = 156  
Complete paraplegia = 157 |
| Johnston et al. 2005 | Cross-sectional survey | New Jersey Outpatient SCI Center | N=107 (88M, 19F)  
Mean age 39.1(11.16)  
Median age 38.0  
Mean post-injury time: 11.36(9.56) yrs  
Median post-injury time: 8.71 yrs  
Community-living traumatic SCI individuals  
ASIA-A/B/C/D: 56.4%/20.2%/14.9%/8.5%  
Neurologic Category:  
Tetraplegia complete: 38.7%  
Tetraplegia incomplete: 15.1%  
Paraplegia complete: 37.6% |
1. RELIABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
<th>Test-retest, Inter-rater, Intra-rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dijkers 1999</td>
<td>Principal component factor analysis revealed one factor, which explained 61.1% of the variance. Item loadings ranged from 0.64 to 0.84.</td>
<td>A subgroup (n=165) completed the SLWS twice, with a follow-up interval range of 93-626 days. Test-retest correlation for the whole scale was 0.65 and for individual items was between 0.39 and 0.60 (P&lt;.001 for all).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post et al. 2012</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha for the whole scale = 0.83</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Krause et al. 2009 | Follow-up survey | Hospital in the Southeastern United States | 727 SCI subjects mean age: 47.9
70.2% male
75.8% White
53.3% cervical injury
Average years since injury = 18.2

A total of 1,385 participants were enrolled in the original study in 1997–1998. Participants were then contacted in 2007–2008 to participate in a follow-up survey. At that time, 306 were deceased, 34 could not be located, and 5 were eliminated. Responses were received by 727 participants, yielding an adjusted response rate of 69.5% percent.

Post et al. 2012 | Cross-sectional study 5 years after discharge from inpatient rehab | 8 rehab centres with specialized SCI units | 145 SCI participants (104 men, 41 women)
mean age: 45.4±13.7
27 incomplete paraplegia
65 complete paraplegia
16 incomplete tetraplegia
37 complete tetraplegia
116 traumatic SCI, 29 non-traumatic

Richardson and Richards 2008 | Retrospective analysis | National Spinal Cord Injury Database (NSCID) | 2570 participants
1 year postinjury: 682 subjects (535 M, 147F)
mean age: 38.66±15.32
5 years postinjury: 517 subjects (402M, 115F)
mean age: 40.26±14.53
15 years postinjury: 653 subjects (518M, 135F)
mean age: 42.72±10.09
25 years postinjury: 718 subjects (558M, 160F)
mean age: 49.49±8.60

Scherer & Cushman 2001 | Cross-sectional | Acute medical rehabilitation unit in a general hospital | N=20
Age: 51.05±16.44, range 22-78 years
10 female, 10 male
13 paraplegia (4 complete), 7 tetraplegia (1 complete)
## 2. VALIDITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID</th>
<th>Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dijkers 1999 | SWLS scores were correlated to those for the Functional Independence Measure (FIM) and the Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique (CHART).  
### ANOVA and Eta².  
Both FIM subscales (motor and sociocognitive) and all four CHART subscales (physical independence, mobility, social integration and occupation) were significantly correlated to SLWS scores (P<.001).  
Effect size (Eta²):  
FIM  
motor = 0.05  
sociocognitive = 0.02  
CHART  
physical independence = 0.14  
mobility = 0.11  
social integration = 0.11  
occupation = 0.14  
### Stepwise Regression Analysis.  
(Beta weights and significance level indicated in brackets.)  
Adding the FIM motor (0.21, P<.0001) and sociocognitive (0.10, P<.0001) variables into the regression produced an R² value of 0.14.  
Adding the CHART subscales of physical independence, mobility (0.26, P<.0001), occupation (0.10, P<.001) and social integration (0.11, P<.0001) produced an R² value of 0.23.  

Scherer & Cushman 2001 | Spearman correlations between the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI), SWLS and Assistive Technology Device Predisposition Assessment (ATD-PA) QOL subset  
ATD-PA QOL & SWLS: r=0.89, (P<.01)  
BSI & SWLS: r=-0.64, (P<.01)  
Correlations between the 5 SWLS and 11 QOL subset items were positive and generally high, with the exception of QOL item 16.  
Of the 55 correlation coefficients among SWLS and QOL items, 69.1% were significant: 18 at P<.01 and 20 at P<.05.  

Post et al. 2012 | Correlation between the SWLS and scales measuring different constructs:  
FIM-Motor: 0.14 (ns)  
Level of injury: 0.21 (P<.05)  
Completeness of injury: 0.15 (ns)  
Cause of injury: 0.02 (ns)  

| Geyh et al. 2010 | No data available  
Person reliability index: r=0.88 |
| Krause et al. 2009 | Cronbach’s alpha = 0.92.  
No data available |
Age: -0.19 (P<.05)
Sex: 0.02 (ns)
Education: 0.05 (ns)

Spearman’s correlations:
Correlation between the SWLS and scales measuring the same construct as the SWLS:
Life Satisfaction Questionnaire (LISAT-9) vs. SWLS: 0.60 (ns)
SWLS vs. MHI-5 (mental health subscale of SF-36): 0.48 (P<.01)
SWLS vs. SIP-SOC (social dimension of SIP-68): -0.41 (P<.01)

Richards and Richards 2008

With PHQ-9:
Among persons 1 year postinjury, both affective and somatic subscores showed a significant inverse correlation with satisfaction with life ($r_s = -0.463$, P<.001, and $r_s = -0.346$, P<.001, respectively). Significant negative correlations were also found between SWLS scores and factor subscores at 5 years postinjury ($r_s = -0.415$, P<.001 for the somatic subscore; $r_s = -0.456$, P<.001 for the affective subscore) and at 15 years postinjury ($r_s = -0.404$, P<.001, for the affective subscore; $r_s = -0.248$, P<.001, for the somatic subscore). Authors did not state if the negative correlation was expected.

Regarding the 25 years postinjury group, the affective subscale also correlated significantly, and in a negative direction, with satisfaction with life ($r_s = -0.368$, P<.001). A significant negative relationship was also found with the somatic subscale for the 25 year postinjury group ($r_s = -0.255$, P<.001).

Hitzig et al. 2012

To evaluate the construct validity of the Reintegration to Normal Living Index (RNL) compared with the SWLS, a 3 factor CFA model was fit to the combined items of both scales. A 1-factor CFA of items of both scales yielded poor fit (RMSEA = 0.173, CFI = 0.822, TLI = 0.908). The 3-factor model was an appropriate fit (RMSEA = 0.067, CFI = 0.963, TLI = 0.986).

Interfactor correlations showed a stronger relationship between the scores of the 2 factors of the RNL Index than between each factor and the SWLS. Hence, the 3-factor CFA supports our hypothesis that the SWLS and RNL Index assess distinct, although related, constructs.

Krause et al. 2009

Spearman Rank correlations between SWLS and:
Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9): -0.477
Major depressive disorder: -0.335
Older Adult Health and Mood Questionnaire (OAHMQ): -0.538

(P<.0001 for all the above)

Johnston et al. 2005

Pearson’s r bwn SWLS and ASIA Motor Score: -0.07 (P=0.55)

3. RESPONSIVENESS – no data available

4. FLOOR/CEILING EFFECT – no data available

5. INTERPRETABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author ID</th>
<th>Interpretability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dijkers 1999</td>
<td>Summary statistics for the 5 SWLS items and SWLS total: (n=2183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. In most ways my life is close to ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The conditions of my life are excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I am satisfied with my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWLS total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEM for total SWLS (calculated from data in Dijkers et al. 1999): 4.67
MDC for total SWLS (calculated from data in Dijkers et al. 1999): 12.95
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In most ways my life is close to ideal</td>
<td>3.40 (2.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The conditions of my life are excellent</td>
<td>3.05 (2.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with my life</td>
<td>4.05 (2.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life</td>
<td>4.05 (2.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing</td>
<td>3.45 (2.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWLS total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5 (5.9)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ALL (n=243) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>AUS (n=40) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>BRZ (n=34) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>CAN (n=34) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>ISR (n=71) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>RSA (n=30) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>USA (n=34) Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 1</td>
<td>3.3 (1.9)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.5 (1.8)</td>
<td>4.1 (2.1)</td>
<td>3.3 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.5 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.6 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 2</td>
<td>3.5 (1.9)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (1.7)</td>
<td>4.2 (2.1)</td>
<td>3.5 (1.9)</td>
<td>2.7 (1.8)</td>
<td>3.7 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 3</td>
<td>4.0 (1.9)</td>
<td>4.1 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.7 (2.0)</td>
<td>4.4 (2.0)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.9)</td>
<td>3.6 (1.9)</td>
<td>4.3 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 4</td>
<td>3.9 (1.8)</td>
<td>4.0 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.5 (2.0)</td>
<td>4.6 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.8 (1.8)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.4)</td>
<td>4.4 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 5</td>
<td>3.5 (1.9)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.8)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.7)</td>
<td>4.8 (1.9)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.5 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWLS total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.2 (7.4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.2 (6.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.3 (7.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.2 (7.7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.3 (7.1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1 (6.7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.6 (8.5)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUS = Australia  
BRZ = Brazil  
CAN = Canada  
ISR = Israel  
RSA = Republic of South-Africa  
USA = United States of America

Standard error of item location for the SWLS items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS 5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hitzig et al. 2012  
Mean SWLS score = 21.4±7.4