

Table 1: Tools to Assess Participation and Quality of Life

Assessment Tool	Purpose	Items and Administration	Additional Considerations	Availability
Health Status				
<p>Stroke Impact Scale (SIS)</p> <p>Duncan et al. 2003</p>	<p>The SIS is a measure of health status following stroke</p>	<p>59-items representing 8 domains: strength, hand function, ADL/IADL, Mobility, Communication, Emotion, Memory and Thinking, and Participation/Role Function. Each item is rated on a 5-point ordinal scale, with the exception of a single item rated on a 100-point visual analog scale.</p> <p><u>Score Interpretation:</u> Scores are summed for each domain and range from 0-100, with higher scores indicating more recovery.</p> <p><u>Administration:</u> Self-report; 15-20 minutes to administer</p>	<p>The SIS is easy to administer, does not require any additional equipment, and can be administered by mail or telephone. The measure can also be completed by proxy respondents, although there is some evidence that proxies tend to rate patients as being more impaired.</p> <p>Some ceiling effects have been observed for individuals with mild impairment, particularly, in the Emotion, Communication, and Memory and Thinking domains.</p> <p><u>Specialized Training:</u> None required.</p>	<p>Free for non-profit use after signing a licensing agreement</p> <p>http://www.strokengine.ca/assess/sis/</p>
<p>Medical Outcomes Study Short Form 36 SF-36</p> <p>(Ware & Sherbourne 1992)</p>	<p>The SF-36 was designed as a generic health survey for the assessment of health status in the general population.</p>	<p>36 items are organized into 8 subscales; physical functioning, role limitations- physical, bodily pain, social functioning, general mental health, role limitations – emotional, vitality, and general health perceptions. 2 additional questions estimate change in overall health status over the past year. With the exception of the general change in health status questions, subjects are asked to respond with reference to the past 4 weeks.</p> <p>Items are scored using a weighted Likert system. Items are summed to provide subscale scores which are transformed linearly to provide a score from 0-100 for each subscale. In addition, a physical component (PCS) and mental component (MCS) score may be derived. The 2 health status questions remain separate from the 8 subscales and are not scored.</p> <p><u>Score Interpretation:</u> There are normative subscale scores based on population data available for a number of different countries. In</p>	<p>The SF-36 questionnaire can be administered by self-completion questionnaire or by interview (either on the telephone or in-person). It has been used as a mail survey with reasonably high completion rates reported, however, data obtained are more complete when interview administration is used. It should be noted that some items have been questioned as less relevant for use in the assessment of elderly populations.</p> <p>The SF-36 has been studied for use by proxy, however, reliability of the test decreased when proxy respondents completed assessments.</p>	<p>Available without charge</p> <p>http://www.rand.org/health/surveys_tools/mos/mos_core_36item.html</p> <p>There are terms and conditions for use posted on the site.</p>

Assessment Tool	Purpose	Items and Administration	Additional Considerations	Availability
		<p>addition, component scores have also been standardized with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10.</p> <p><u>Administration:</u> Approx. 10 minutes. Self-report or by interview.</p>	<p><u>Specialized training:</u> None required.</p>	
Participation/Extended Activities of Daily Living				
<p>Assessment of Life Habits (LIFE-H 3.1)</p> <p>Fougeyrollas et al. 2001</p>	<p>The LIFE-H is a measure of the accomplishment of daily activities and social roles.</p>	<p>77-items representing 12 domains. Items are rated on two-scales: 1) level of difficulty/type of assistance required (10-point ordinal scale) and 2) satisfaction with performance (5-point ordinal scale).</p> <p><u>Score Interpretation:</u> Scores are summed and presented as an average of items answered, with lower scores indicating less optimal subjective participation. Ratings on the Satisfaction with Performance scale are not included as part of the total score.</p> <p><u>Administration:</u> self-report; 20-30 minutes to administer.</p>	<p>The LIFE-H is easy to administer and does not require specialized equipment.</p> <p>The scale is not available for free, is somewhat lengthy, and some concern has been expressed regarding ceiling effects in patients with mild stroke (Rochette et al. 2007).</p> <p><u>Specialized Training:</u> Recommended.</p>	<p>Available for purchase by request</p> <p>http://www.stroking.ca/assess/lifeh/</p>
<p>Frenchay Activities Index (FAI)</p> <p>(Holbrook & Skilbeck 1983)</p>	<p>The FAI provides an assessment of a broad range of activities associated with everyday life.</p>	<p>The FAI contains 15 items or activities that can be separated into 3 factors; domestic chores, leisure/work and outdoor activities. The frequency with which each item or activity is undertaken over the past 3 or 6 months (depending on the nature of the activity) is assigned a score of 1 – 4 where a score of 1 is indicative of the lowest level of activity.</p> <p><u>Score Interpretation:</u> Summed scores range from 15-60.</p>	<p>Simple and brief. Well suited to use in most clinical settings. However, lack of standardized guidelines for administration or interpretation may reduce comparability between settings, groups or studies.</p> <p>The FAI extends information about function along the ADL continuum in terms of item difficulty. It should be noted that FAI scores may be influenced by both gender and age.</p> <p>The FAI is suitable for use with proxy respondents. The scale is based on behaviour and the emphasis placed</p>	<p>Free of charge</p> <p>http://www.stroking.ca/assess/fai/</p>

Assessment Tool	Purpose	Items and Administration	Additional Considerations	Availability
		<u>Administration:</u> 5 minutes or less. Self-report or interview.	on frequency rather than quality of activity. This reduces elements of subjectivity which can undermine reliability of proxy assessment. <u>Specialized Training:</u> None required.	
London Handicap Scale (LHS) Harwood & Gompertz, 1994	The LHS is a measure of the degree of disadvantage perceived by an individual as the result of an illness/handicap.	6-items, each representing a single dimension: Mobility, Physical Independence, Occupation, Social Integration, Orientation, and Economic Self Sufficiency. Responses are rated on a 6-point ordinal scale relating to the degree of perceived disadvantage. <u>Score Interpretation:</u> The LHS provides a profile of handicap based on the responses within each of the 6 dimensions as well as a weighted total handicap score. This overall weighted score should be interpreted as an estimate of the desirability of the health state described by the respondent's profile. Scale weights are used to calculate total scores, which range from 0 to 1.0, with lower scores indicating more disability. <u>Administration:</u> Self-report; approximately 5 minutes to administer	LHS appears to facilitate the assessment of 'participation', though response statements span all domains of the ICF. Statements that describe body functions are typically associated with greater degrees of restriction in participation (Perenboom and Chorus 2003). The LHS is brief, easy to administer and does not require any specialized equipment. It can be administered via mail or completed by a proxy respondent. Use of a weighted scale makes calculation of total scores relatively arduous, as compared to other measures. More independent research is required to assess the psychometric properties of the LHS (Salter et al. 2012). <u>Specialized Training:</u> Not required.	Free http://www.rehabmeasures.org/Lists/RehabMeasures/DispForm.aspx?ID=929
Reintegration to Normal Living Index (RNLI) Wood-Dauphinee et al.	The RNLI is a measure of reintegration to normal activities following illness	11 declarative statements rated by respondents on a 10cm visual analogue scale. <u>Score Interpretation:</u> Summed scores are reported as a percentage out of 100, with lower scores	The tool focuses on the perception of the individual with regard to personal capability and/or autonomy. It may be considered a person-centred assessment of re-integration.	Free http://www.stroking.ca/assess/rnli/

Assessment Tool	Purpose	Items and Administration	Additional Considerations	Availability
1988	of trauma.	<p>indicating poorer perceptions of reintegration. Scores can also be calculated for Daily Functioning and Perceptions of Self subscales.</p> <p><u>Administration:</u> Self-report; approximately 10 minutes to administer.</p>	<p>Quick, easy to administer, and does not require any additional equipment.</p> <p>The visual analogue response format may not be appropriate for use with some stroke patients (e.g., those with neglect or visuospatial deficits). Concern has been expressed regarding the use of proxy respondents (Tooth et al. 2003).</p> <p><u>Specialized Training:</u> Not required.</p>	
Health-related Quality of Life				
<p>EuroQoL Quality of Life Scale (EQ-5D)</p> <p>EuroQoL Group, 1990</p>	The EQ-5D is a measure of health-related quality of life.	<p>Part 1 consists of 5 domains: Mobility, Self-care, Usual Activities, Pain/Discomfort, and Anxiety/Depression. For each domain, respondents are asked to indicate which 1 of 3 statements best describes their current health state. Part 2 consists of a 100 cm visual analog scale representing “your own health state today.”</p> <p><u>Score Interpretation:</u> Weights are applied to calculate a summary index score, which range from 0 to 1, with higher scores indicating more quality of life.</p> <p><u>Administration:</u> Self-report; approximately 3 minutes to administer.</p>	<p>The EQ-5D is short, easy to administer, and does not require any specialized equipment. The measure can be administered in person or by mail</p> <p>Although the EQ-5D can be completed by a proxy respondent, decreased reliability has been reported (Dorman et al. 1998). Patient-proxy agreement rates have also been reported to be low on the more subjective domains (e.g., anxiety/depression, and pain/discomfort) (Picard et al. 2004).</p> <p><u>Specialized Training:</u> Not required.</p>	<p>Licensing fees may be required</p> <p>http://www.euroqol.org/</p>
Stroke Specific Quality of Life Scale (SS-QOL)	The SS-QOL is a measure of	49-items representing 12 domains: energy, family roles, language, mobility, mood, personality, self-	Quick, easy to administer, and does not require any additional equipment.	Free

Assessment Tool	Purpose	Items and Administration	Additional Considerations	Availability
Williams et al. 1999	health-related quality of life.	<p>care, social roles, thinking, upper extremity function, vision, and work/productivity. Items are rated on a 5-point ordinal scale.</p> <p><u>Score Interpretation:</u> Summation yields a total score ranging from 49 to 245, with higher scores indicating better functioning. Subscale scores can also be calculated.</p> <p><u>Administration:</u> Self-report; approximately 10-15 minutes to administer.</p>	<p>The SS-QOL can be completed by proxy respondents; however, agreement rates have been reported to be weaker for items that are more subjective as compared to those that are more observable (Williams et al. 2000). Some concern has been expressed regarding floor and ceiling effects (Czechowsky & Hill, 2002).</p> <p><u>Specialized Training:</u> Not required.</p>	<p>http://www.stroking.ca/assess/ssqol/</p>
Stroke-Adapted Sickness Impact Profile (SA-SIP-30) Van Straten et al. 1997	The SA-SIP-30 is a measure of health-related quality of life	<p>30-items representing 8 domains: Body Care and Movement, Social Interaction, Mobility, Communication, Emotional Behavior, Household Management, Alertness Behavior, and Ambulation. Respondents are asked to mark “yes” for each item that is descriptive of the impact of illness on their daily life.</p> <p><u>Score Interpretation:</u> Items are weighted, summed, and expressed as a percentage, with higher scores indicating less quality of life. Subscale scores can also be calculated. The scale authors have suggested a cut-off score of >33 as being indicative of poor health.</p> <p><u>Administration:</u> Self-report; approximately 10 minutes to administer.</p>	<p>The SA-SIP-30 is much shorter and easier to administer than the original 136-item scale. However, evidence suggests that the shorter version may not perform as well when used with patients with more severe stroke (van Straten et al. 1997).</p> <p>No specialized equipment is required.</p> <p><u>Specialized Training:</u> Not required.</p>	<p>Free</p> <p>http://www.stroking.ca/assess/sasip30/</p>
Assessment of Caregiver Burden				
Bakas Caregiving Outcomes Scale	Assesses adaptation to caregiving in informal carers of individuals	Originally a 10 item scale, the 15-item version is used more often. Items reflect changes in social functioning, subjective well-being and perceived health attributable to fulfilling the role of informal carer. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert scale	Assesses both the positive and negative aspects of the caregiving role. Emphasis is placed on the subjective, social aspects of change	The 15-Item BCOS is available upon request from Dr Tamilyn Bakas (Bakas et al. 2006)

Assessment Tool	Purpose	Items and Administration	Additional Considerations	Availability
(Bakas et al. 1999, 2006)	with stroke.	ranging from -3 (changed for the worst) to +3 (changed for the best). Scores and interpretation: Item scores transformed to 1-7, then summed to provide total scale scores ranging from 15 – 105. Administration: Self-report. Requires 2-4 minutes to complete	associated with caregiving. Specialized training: None required	
Caregiver Strain Index (Robinson 1983)	Originally developed as a screening instrument to detect strain (stress) in carers of individuals with hip surgery and heart disease.	13 items rated as yes or no. Positive responses receive 1 point; negative receive no score. Scores and Interpretation: Item scores are summed to create total scores out of a possible 13. Administration: Self-report.	Short and simple. Most commonly used scale for the assessment of burden, particularly in research settings. Although used frequently, its psychometric properties have not been well-studied in populations of individuals with stroke. Specialized Training: None required.	Free. Available via: http://www.rehabmeasures.org/Lists/RehabMeasures/DispForm.aspx?ID=1099
Zarit Burden Interview (Zarit et al. 1980)	Measures the degree to which responsibilities associated with informal caregiving role have affected health, personal and social well-being. Originally developed to assess carers of individuals with	29-item instrument includes items addressing caregiver health, well-being, finances, social life and the relationship between carer and the individual being cared for. 25 questions represent negative aspects of caring; 4 items represent positive aspects. Items are scored on a 5-point Likert scale (0-4). There are no subscales. Scores and Interpretation: Scores for 'negative' items are totaled, then 'positive' items subtracted to create an overall total score. Total scores are intended to reflect degree of burden.	Shorter 22, 18 and 12-item versions of the interview are also available. The 22-item version is used most frequently. Scores appear unaffected by age, gender language, marital or employment status, geographic locale suggesting the scale may be acceptable for a variety of assessment populations (Hebert et al. 2000). The Interview examines burden that	Free for use in non-funded studies only. Funded research or commercial use requires purchase/permission.

Assessment Tool	Purpose	Items and Administration	Additional Considerations	Availability
	dementia.	<p>Administration: Self-report. Pen and paper or interview-administered.</p>	<p>is associated with both functional and behavioural impairments and with the situation in the home. Items focus on the subjective response of the carer.</p> <p>Specialized training: None required.</p>	

Reference List

- Andresen E, Gravitt G, Aydelotte M, Podgorski C. Limitations of the SF-36 in a sample to nursing home residents. *Age and Ageing*. 1999;28:562-566.
- Andresen E, Meyers A. Health-related quality of life outcomes measures. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2000;81(Suppl 2):S30-S45.
- Appelros P. Characteristics of the Frenchay Activities Index one year after a stroke: a population-based study. *Disabil.Rehabil*. 2007;29(10):785-790.
- Bakas T. Bakas Caregiving Outcomes Scale. In: Michalos AC, ed. *Encyclopaedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* Dordrecht: Springer Science and Business Media; 2014.
- Bakas T, Champion V. Development and psychometric testing of the Bakas Caregiving Outcomes Scale. *Nurs Res*. 1999;48(5):250-259.
- Bakas T, Champion V, Perkins SM, Farran CJ, Williams LS. Psychometric testing of the revised 15-item Bakas Caregiving Outcomes Scale. *Nurs Res*. 2006;55(5):346-355.
- Brazier J, Harper R, Jones N, et al. Validating the SF-36 health survey questionnaire: new outcome measure for primary care. *BMJ*. 1992;305:160-164.
- Brazier JE, Walters SJ, Nicholl JP, Kohler B. Using the SF-36 and the Euroqol on an elderly population. *Quality of Life Research*. 1996;5:195-204.
- Cardol M, Brandsma JW, de Groot IJM, van den Bos GAM, de Haan RJ, de Jong BA. Handicap questionnaires: what do they assess? *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 1999;21(3):97-105.
- Czechowsky D, Hill MD. Neurological Outcome and Quality of Life after Stroke due to Vertebral Artery Dissection. *Cerebrovascular Diseases* 2002;13:192-197.
- Deeken JF, Taylor KL, Mangan P, Yabroff KR, Ingham JM. Care for the Caregivers: A Review of Self-Report Instruments Developed to Measure the Burden, Needs, and Quality of Life of Informal Caregivers. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2003;26(4):922-953.
- Dorman PJ, Slattery J, Farrell B, Dennis M, Sandercock P, for the United Kingdom Collaborators in the International Stroke Trial (IST). Qualitative comparison of the reliability of health status assessments with the EuroQol and SF-36 questionnaires after stroke. *Stroke* 1998;29:63-68.
- Duncan PW, Bode RK, Lai SM, Perera S. Rasch analysis of a new stroke-specific outcome scale: the Stroke Impact Scale. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2003;84:950-963.
- EuroQol Group. EuroQol – a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health Policy* 1990;16:199-208.
- Finch E, Brooks D, Stratford PW, Mayo NE. *Physical Rehabilitations Outcome Measures. A Guide to Enhanced Clinical Decision-Making*. 2nd ed. Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Physiotherapy Association; 2002.
- Fougeyrollas P, Noreau L, St-Michel G. Life Habits measure - Shortened version (LIFE-H 3.1). International Network on Disability Creation Process, Lac St Lac St-Charles, Québec, Canada, 2001.
- Harwood RH, Rogers A, Dickinson E, Ebrahim S. Measuring handicap: the London Handicap Scale, a new outcome measure for chronic disease. *Qual Health Care* 1994;3:11-16.
- Harwood RH, Ebrahim S. Measuring the outcomes of day hospital attendance: a comparison of the Barthel Index and London Handicap Scale. *Clin Rehabil*. 2000;14(5):527-531.
- Harwood RH, Ebrahim S. A comparison of the responsiveness of the Nottingham extended activities of daily living scale, London handicap scale and SF-36. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2000;22(17):786-793.
- Hayes V, Morris J, Wolfe C, Morgan M. The SF-36 Health Survey Questionnaire: Is it suitable for use with older adults? *Age and Aging*. 1995;24:120-125.
- Hébert R, Bravo G, Prévile M. Reliability, validity and reference values of the zarit burden interview for assessing informal caregivers of community-dwelling older persons with dementia. *Canadian Journal on Aging*. 2000;19(4):494-507.
- Hewlett S, Dures M, Almeida C. Measures of fatigue. *Arthritic Care & Res* 2011;63(11):S263-286.
- Holbrook M, Skillbeck CE. An activities index for use with stroke patients. *Age and Aging*. 1983;12:166-170.
- Krupp, L. B., LaRocca, N. G., et al. The fatigue severity scale. Application to patients with multiple sclerosis and systemic lupus erythematosus. *Arch Neurol* 1989;46(10):1121-1123.
- Lerdal A, Kottorp A. Psychometric properties of the Fatigue Severity Scale-Rasch analyses of individual responses in a Norwegian stroke cohort. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2011;48(10):1258-1265.
- Mallinson S. Listening to respondents: a qualitative assessment of the Short-Form 36 health status questionnaire. *Soc Sci Med*. 2002;54:11-21.

- McDowell I, Newell C. *Measuring Health. A Guide to Rating Scales and Questionnaires*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 1996.
- McHorney CA, Ware JEJ, Raczek AE. The MOS 36-item short form health survey (SF-36) II: Psychometric and clinical tests of validity in measuring physical and mental health constructs. *Medical Care*. 1993;31(3):247-263.
- O'Mahoney PG, Rodgers H, Thomson RG, Dobson R, et al. Is the SF-36 suitable for assessing health status of older stroke patients? *Age and Aging*. 1998;27(1):19-23.
- Pederson PM, Jorgensen HA, Nakayama H, Raaschou HO, Olsen TS. Comprehensive assessment of activities of daily living in stroke. The Copenhagen Stroke Study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1997;78:161-165.
- Pickard AS, Johnson JA, Feeny DH, Shuaib A, Carriere KC, Nasser AM. Agreement between patient and proxy assessments of health-related quality of life after stroke using the EQ-5D and Health Utilities Index. *Stroke* 2004;35(2):607-612.
- Robinson BC. Validation of a Caregiver Strain Index. *J Gerontol*. 1983;38(3):344-348.
- Rochette A, Desrosiers J, Bravo G, St-Cyr/Tribble D, Bourget A. Changes in participation after a mild stroke: quantitative and qualitative perspectives. *Top Stroke Rehabil* 2007;14(3):59-68.
- Salter K, Jutai J, Zettler L, Moses M, McClure JA, Mays R, Foley N, Teasell R. Chapter 21. Outcome measures in stroke rehabilitation. In *The Evidence Based Review of Stroke Rehabilitation (15th edition)*. www.ebrsr.com/uploads/chapter-21-outcome-assessment-SREBR-15_.pdf. Updated August 2012.
- Segal ME, Schall RR. Determining functional/health status and its relation to disability in stroke survivors. *Stroke*. 1994;25:2391-2397.
- Smets E, Garssen B, Bonke B, De Haes J. The Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI): psychometric qualities of an instrument to assess fatigue. *J Psychosomatic Res* 1995;39:315-325.
- Sveen U, Bautz-Holter E, Sodrings KM, Wyller TB, Laake K. Association between impairments, self-care ability and social activities 1 year after stroke. *Disabil Rehabil*. 1999;21(8):372-377.
- Tooth LR, McKenna KT, et al. Reliability of scores between stroke patients and significant others on the Reintegration to Normal (RNL) Index. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003;25:433-440.
- Van Durme T, Macq J, Jeanmart C, Gobert M. Tools for measuring the impact of informal caregiving of the elderly: a literature review. *International journal of nursing studies*. 2012;49(4):490-504.
- van Straten A, de Haan RJ, Limburg M, Schuling J, Bossuyt PM, van den Bos GAM. A Stroke-Adapted 30-Item Version of the Sickness Impact Profile to Assess Quality of Life (SA-SIP30). *Stroke* 1997;28:2155-2161.
- Visser-Meily JM, Post MW, Riphagen, II, Lindeman E. Measures used to assess burden among caregivers of stroke patients: a review. *Clin Rehabil*. 2004;18(6):601-623.
- Wade D. *Measurement in neurological rehabilitation*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1992.
- Wade D, Leigh-Smith J, Langton-Hewer R. Social activities after stroke: measurement and natural history using the Frenchay Activities Index. *Int Rehabil Med*. 1985;1:176-181.
- Ware JEJ, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF36) I: Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care*. 1992;30(6):473-483.
- Whitlatch CJ, Zarit SH, von Eye A. Efficacy of interventions with caregivers: a reanalysis. *Gerontologist*. 1991;31(1):9-14.
- Williams LS, Bakas T, Brizendine E, et al. How valid are family proxy assessments of stroke patients' health-related quality of life? *Stroke* 2006;37:2081-2085.
- Williams LS, Weinberger M, Harris MD, Clark DO, Biller J. Development of a stroke-specific quality of life scale. *Stroke* 1999;30(7):1362-1369.
- Wood-Dauphinee SL, Opzoomer MA, Williams JI, Marchand B, Spitzer WO. Assessment of global function: The reintegration to Normal Living Index. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1988;69:583-590.
- Zarit SH, Reever KE, Bach-Peterson J. Relatives of the impaired elderly: correlates of feelings of burden. *Gerontologist*. 1980;20(6):649-655.