

1 **Test-retest reliability and concurrent validity of the**
2 **Adapted Short QUestionnaire to ASsess Health-enhancing**
3 **physical activity (Adapted-SQUASH) in adults with**
4 **disabilities.**

5 Bregje L. Seves^{1*}, Femke Hoekstra^{1,2,3}, Jorrit W.A. Schoenmakers⁴, Pim Brandenbarg^{1,2},
6 Trynke Hoekstra^{2,5}, Florentina J. Hettinga⁶, Rienk Dekker², Lucas H.V. van der Woude^{1,2,8},
7 Cees P. van der Schans^{2,7}

8 ¹ University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Center for Human Movement Sciences,
9 Groningen, The Netherlands.

10 ² University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine,
11 Groningen, The Netherlands.

12 ³ University of British Columbia Okanagan, School of Health and Exercise Sciences, Kelowna, British
13 Columbia, Canada.

14 ⁴ University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Orthopedics, Groningen, The
15 Netherlands.

16 ⁵ Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Health Sciences and Amsterdam Public Health research institute,
17 Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

18 ⁶ Northumbria University, Department of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation, Newcastle, United Kingdom.

19 ⁷ Hanze University of Applied Sciences, Research and Innovation Group in Health Care and Nursing,
20 Groningen, The Netherlands.

21 ⁸ Peter Harrison Centre for Disability Sport, School of Sport, Exercise & Health Sciences,
22 Loughborough University, UK.

23

24 * Corresponding author

25 E-mail: B.l.seves@umcg.nl

26 Word count: 5948

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 **Abstract**

28 The current study determined the test-retest reliability and concurrent validity of the Adapted
29 Short QUestionnaire to ASsess Health-enhancing physical activity (Adapted-SQUASH) in
30 adults with disabilities. Before filling in the Adapted-SQUASH twice with a recall period of
31 two weeks, participants wore the Actiheart activity monitor up to one week. For the test-retest
32 reliability (N=68), Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) were 0.67 ($p < 0.001$) for the total
33 activity score (min x intensity/week) and 0.76 ($p < 0.001$) for the total minutes of activity
34 (min/week). For the concurrent validity (N=58), the Spearman correlation coefficient was 0.40
35 ($p = 0.002$) between the total activity score of the first administration of the Adapted-SQUASH
36 and activity energy expenditure from the Actiheart ($\text{kcal} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$). The ICC was 0.22
37 ($p = 0.027$) between the total minutes of activity assessed with the first administration of the
38 Adapted-SQUASH and Actiheart. The Adapted-SQUASH is an acceptable measure to assess
39 self-reported physical activity in large populations of adults with disabilities, but is not
40 applicable at the individual level due to wide limits of agreement. Self-reported physical activity
41 assessed with the Adapted-SQUASH does not accurately represent physical activity assessed
42 with the Actiheart in adults with disabilities, as indicated with a systematic bias between both
43 instruments in the Bland-Altman analysis.

44

45 **Key words**

46 Physical activity assessment, accelerometer, chronic disease, rehabilitation, health promotion

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Measuring patients' physical activity behaviour is important for evaluating effectivity of
50 physical activity promotion interventions and, ideally, individually tailoring rehabilitation

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

51 programmes among adults suffering from a physical disability and/or chronic disease that
52 impairs mobility (further: adults with disabilities) [1]. Therefore, an accurate and efficient
53 measurement instrument for assessing (self-reported) physical activity in people with physical
54 disabilities is essential. Although accelerometer-derived physical activity might be preferred,
55 mostly it is not practically feasible, and it is too expensive among large scale populations in
56 interventions and/or cohort studies. Self-reports are frequently used measurement tools to
57 assess physical activity in disabled populations, both in rehabilitation practice and in research
58 [2,3]. Also, questionnaires are easy to fill in [4-6]. However, self-reported physical activity
59 depends on the persons' recall and mostly is not sensitive for light physical activities at home
60 (e.g. walking from the bedroom to the toilet and from the kitchen to the dining table) or outside
61 (e.g. walking to the mailbox to post a letter) [7].

62 A self-reported physical activity measure was needed in the multicentre longitudinal
63 cohort study Rehabilitation, Sports and Active lifestyle (ReSpAct) to evaluate physical activity
64 during and after the physical activity stimulation programme Rehabilitation, Sports and
65 Exercise (RSE; Dutch: 'Revalidatie, Sport en Bewegen') [8,9]. The RSE programme was
66 successfully implemented in eighteen rehabilitation institutions in the Netherlands [10]. The
67 questionnaire was required to be suitable for the target population: people with a physical
68 disability and/or chronic disease. There are few physical activity questionnaires available
69 specifically developed for adults with disabilities [3]. The Physical Activity Scale for
70 Individuals with Physical Disabilities (PASIPD) [11] was considered for the ReSpAct study,
71 since it is commonly used amongst the target population. To precisely assess the physical
72 activity behaviour before and after a physical activity promotion intervention [6], and to clarify
73 the dose-response relationship between physical activity and the received counselling during
74 the intervention [12], frequency, intensity, duration and type of the activity should be measured.
75 The PASIPD assesses duration and type of physical activities but does not specifically assess

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

76 the frequency and intensity of physical activities, whereby it was considered not applicable for
77 the ReSpAct cohort. The Short Questionnaire to Assess Health-enhancing physical activity
78 (SQUASH) developed for healthy adults does measure frequency, intensity, duration and type
79 of physical activities [4]. The SQUASH is widely used, for example by governmental agencies
80 to monitor large scale physical activity behaviour among the Dutch population and to monitor
81 whether physical activity guidelines are achieved. Studies on the psychometric properties of the
82 SQUASH have supported the appropriateness of the SQUASH to measure the level of weekly
83 physical activity in a healthy adult population [4], in patients after a total hip arthroplasty [13]
84 and in outpatients with ankylosing spondylitis [14].

85 When assessing physical activity in adults with disabilities, it needs to be taken into
86 account that this target population may have a different perceived intensity of activities
87 compared to a healthy population [15]. It is expected that adults with a disability experience
88 activities as more intense, because activities often cost (absolutely and relatively) more energy
89 compared to healthy adults [16,17]. Therefore, the ReSpAct research team converted the
90 original SQUASH into a measurement tool (mentioned from here: the Adapted-SQUASH) that
91 was expected to better meet the perceived intensity of activities among people with disabilities
92 compared with the original SQUASH, by using appropriate metabolic equivalent of task (MET)
93 values for this target population. Also, the SQUASH was adapted to better match the activity
94 pattern of wheelchair users by including common physical activity behaviours: wheelchair
95 sports (e.g. wheelchair basketball) and questions concerning wheelchair propulsion and
96 handcycling [9]. The SQUASH has two main outcome measures: the activity score, measuring
97 a combination of intensity and duration of physical activity per week, and total minutes of
98 activity per week (duration).

99 It is relevant for (rehabilitation) practice and research in (adapted) physical activity to
100 determine the psychometric properties of the Adapted-SQUASH among a sample of adults with

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

101 disabilities. Apart from test-retest reliability, construct validity is deemed an important asset.
102 The Actiheart (Cambridge Neurotechnology™ UK), an uniaxial activity monitor, was
103 identified by the research team as a suitable criterion measure to compare with the outcomes of
104 the Adapted-SQUASH. Since the Actiheart is a medical device, it is suitable for ambulant
105 people with disabilities. The Actiheart is accurate in measuring physical activity energy
106 expenditure (AEE) in free living conditions, and ideally it combines its measured heart rate and
107 movement sensor information improving the prediction of AEE in daily physical activities
108 [5,18].

109 The current study aims to determine the test-retest reliability and concurrent validity of
110 the Adapted-SQUASH among adults with disabilities. We focused on the two main outcome
111 measures of the Adapted-SQUASH, the total activity score and the total minutes of activity per
112 week [4], which were derived from the test and retest of the Adapted-SQUASH as well as from
113 the Actiheart activity monitor among a convenience sample of adults with disabilities.

114

115 **Methods**

116 **Study population**

117 Participants were recruited through patient activity groups in hospitals, rehabilitation centres,
118 sport clubs and patient associations in the northern and eastern provinces in the Netherlands.
119 Inclusion criteria were being at least eighteen years of age, having a physical disability and/or
120 chronic disease (e.g. stroke, heart failure, Parkinson's disease) and being able to read and write
121 the Dutch language. Participants were excluded when they were still receiving inpatient or
122 outpatient rehabilitation care, were participating in the ReSpAct study [8,9], were completely
123 wheelchair dependent (because of the use of the Actiheart), or were not able to complete the
124 questionnaires even with help. The data collection took place from November 2014 till June
125 2016.

126 **Study procedures**

127 This study consisted of a test-retest reliability study and a validity study. For the test-retest
128 reliability study, the participants filled out the first Adapted-SQUASH twice, with
129 approximately two weeks between the measurement occasions.

130 For the validity study, the participant was asked to wear an Actiheart activity monitor
131 (Cambridge Neurotechnology™ UK) to objectively measure physical activity levels during the
132 week prior to administration of the first Adapted-SQUASH. Two researchers visited the
133 participants in their free-living home situation twice, to install and attach the Actiheart to the
134 participants' chest, and to collect the Actiheart after one week. The Actiheart measurement
135 started at 00:00 AM and continued for the next seven consecutive days, both day and night. The
136 participant was instructed to remove the Actiheart during showering, bathing, or swimming. In
137 addition, the participant filled out a diary in which noncompliance to the Actiheart was noted.
138 Measurements were included in the validity study when a minimum registration of the Actiheart
139 of at least four days valid acceleration data (at least 75% activity data registration of 24 hours)
140 for each participant was present [19].

141 Participants' general characteristics were obtained by using a questionnaire. Participant's
142 body weight (kg) and height (m) were measured by researchers by using a personal scale and
143 measuring tape, respectively. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Center
144 of Human Movement Sciences (ECB/2014.06.30_1) at the University of Groningen, University
145 Medical Center Groningen. All participants voluntarily signed an informed consent.

146

147 **The Adapted Short Questionnaire to ASsess Health-enhancing physical** 148 **activity (Adapted-SQUASH)**

149 The 19-item Adapted-SQUASH (see supplemental file) is a self-reported recall questionnaire
150 to assess physical activity among adults with disabilities based on an average week in the past

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

151 month as reference period. Equal to the original SQUASH [4], the Adapted-SQUASH is pre-
152 structured in four main domains outlining types and settings of activity: ‘commuting traffic’,
153 ‘activities at work and school’, ‘household activities’ and ‘leisure time activities’ including
154 ‘sports activities’. The frequency in days per week, the duration in average hours and minutes
155 per day and the perceived intensity were asked.

156 Several adjustments have been made to make the original SQUASH applicable for
157 people with disabilities, as described in the study protocol of the ReSpAct study [9]. First, the
158 items ‘wheelchair riding’ and ‘handcycling’ were added in the domains ‘commuting activities
159 and leisure-time’ and ‘sports activities’. Second, the self-reported intensity of the activity was
160 categorised into ‘light’, ‘moderate’ and ‘vigorous’, instead of ‘slow’, ‘moderate’ and ‘fast’.
161 Third, the syntax to determine the outcome measures of the Adapted-SQUASH includes a large
162 range of Adapted sports (e.g. wheelchair basketball/rugby/tennis) for the item ‘sports
163 activities’. The MET-values in the syntax were updated based on the most recent version of the
164 Ainsworth’ compendium of physical activities [20] and MET-values for wheelchair riding,
165 handcycling and adapted sports were added based on a compendium of energy costs of physical
166 activities for wheelchair dependent individuals [21]. Lastly, in the examples of different sports
167 ‘tennis’ was replaced by ‘(wheelchair) tennis’.

168

169 **The total activity score per week (Adapted-SQUASH)**

170 For practical use of the questionnaire all outcome measures of the Adapted-SQUASH were
171 calculated by using a syntax. The total activity score and the total minutes of activity per week
172 are the main outcomes of the Adapted-SQUASH. The total activity score (min x intensity/week)
173 was calculated following the procedure described by Wendel-Vos et al. (2003). First, all the
174 questions in the Adapted-SQUASH were assigned to a MET-value representing the intensity of
175 this task, based on the Ainsworth’ compendium of physical activities [20] and based on a

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

176 compendium of energy costs of physical activities for wheelchair dependent individuals [21].
177 Second, an activity score was calculated for each domain by multiplying the total minutes of
178 activity with a self-reported intensity score, which is based on age and MET-values [4]. Lastly,
179 the total activity score was calculated by summing up the activity scores of the four domains.
180 In accordance with the original SQUASH, data were excluded if the total minutes of activity a
181 day exceeded 960 minutes or if values were missing [4].

182

183 **The total minutes of activity per week (Adapted-SQUASH)**

184 The total minutes of activity per week (min/week) assessed with the Adapted-SQUASH were
185 calculated by summing up the total minutes of physical activity per week reported in the
186 Adapted-SQUASH. Also, the total minutes of light, moderate and vigorous intensity activities
187 per week (min/week) were calculated, using MET-value cut-off points based on the Dutch
188 physical activity guidelines [22].

189

190 **The Actiheart activity monitor**

191 The Actiheart (Cambridge Neurotechnology™ UK) activity monitor is a combined uniaxial
192 accelerometer and heart rate monitor, which was used to measure accelerometer-derived
193 physical activity. The Actiheart is a reliable and valid measurement method, and was deemed
194 appropriate for our target population, because the combination of accelerometer data with heart
195 rate data would be better able to determine the intensity of physical activities [23]. The Actiheart
196 was attached to the participation's chest by using two Electrocardiography (ECG) electrodes.
197 The Actiheart is a lightweight (8gram) and compact (7x33mm) device, connected to the two
198 ECG electrode and capable of storing time-sequenced data. Acceleration (1D, vertical axis) was
199 measured with a 15-second epoch by a piezoelectric element within the unit with a frequency

200 range of 1-7Hz. The Actiheart output provides activity counts and heart rate data per minute,
201 simultaneously.

202

203 **Activity energy expenditure (Actiheart)**

204 Based on the Actiheart data, AEE estimates in $\text{kcal kg}^{-1} \text{ min}^{-1}$ were calculated for each minute
205 by combining activity counts and heart rate in a branched equations model as described in
206 literature [23,24] and as proposed by the Actiheart software for AEE (see supplemental file). A
207 branched equation model allows the Actiheart to accurately assess AEE even when there is low
208 body movement, but high heart rate during an activity. The combined activity and heart rate
209 algorithm to calculate AEE needs the individual's sleeping heart rate. The sleeping heart rate
210 was calculated by averaging the minute-to-minute heart rate between 2.00-5.00am on the first
211 day the Actiheart was worn.

212 When heart rate was missing, AEE was calculated based on the activity algorithm only
213 for the specific missing minute. The total AEE per week was calculated by summing up the
214 AEE minute-to-minute data, divided by the number of valid days the Actiheart was worn and
215 multiplied by seven (assuming that the average amount of physical activity a day is
216 representative for all weekdays and weekend days).

217 In addition, MET values were calculated for each minute based on the AEE minute-to-
218 minute data, following the Ainsworth' compendium of physical activities [20]. In the next step,
219 MET values per minute were categorised in the following MET categories: sedentary behaviour
220 (1.0-1.5 METs), light intensity (1.6-2.9 METs), moderate intensity (3.0-5.9 METs) and
221 vigorous intensity (≥ 6 METs). Sum scores of all minutes in each MET category were calculated.
222 Also, a sum score for all minutes of physical activity was calculated (≥ 1.6 METs). Sum scores
223 were divided by the number of valid days the Actiheart was worn and multiplied by seven for
224 week scores.

225 **Statistical analysis**

226 Descriptive statistics were used to describe the demographic characteristics of the study
227 population. Test-retest reliability of the Adapted-SQUASH was determined by calculating
228 Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) (two-way random, absolute agreement, single
229 measures) for the total activity score (total, four main domains separately and all individual
230 item separately), as well for the total minutes of activity (total and separately per intensity
231 category) between the first and second measurement occasion. The ICC quantifies the degree
232 to which the two measurements are absolutely related [25]. Since there is no widely accepted
233 criterion for defining the strength of a correlation, we used a general guideline for clinical
234 research: a correlation below 0.25 indicates little or no agreement, a correlation between 0.25
235 and 0.50 indicates fair agreement, a correlation between 0.50 and 0.75 indicates moderate to
236 good agreement and a correlation higher than 0.75 indicates good to excellent agreement [26].
237 Also, confidence intervals were calculated for the ICCs. Additionally, Bland-Altman analyses
238 were performed to illustrate the agreement between the first and second measurement of the
239 Adapted-SQUASH [27,28]. Subsequently, a one-sample t-test was performed to determine any
240 systematic bias.

241 Concurrent validity of the Adapted-SQUASH was determined by calculating a
242 Spearman correlation coefficient between the total activity score (min x intensity/week) based
243 on the baseline administration of the Adapted-SQUASH and the total AEE (kcal^s kg⁻¹/week)
244 based on the Actiheart data. Non-parametric Spearman correlation coefficients were chosen
245 because assumptions of normality were not met for the outcomes of the Adapted-SQUASH and
246 the two continuous outcome variables do not have the same measurement unit. In addition,
247 concurrent validity of the Adapted-SQUASH was determined by calculating an ICC between
248 the total minutes of activity (min/week) based on the baseline administration of the Adapted-
249 SQUASH and the total minutes of activity (min/week) based on the Actiheart data, and by

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

250 performing a Bland-Altman analysis. Although ICCs are preferred if the two measurement
251 instruments are expressed in the same units (min/week) [29], a Spearman correlation coefficient
252 was also calculated between the total minutes of activity assessed with the Adapted-SQUASH
253 and Actiheart to compare our correlation with previous literature [4,11,13,14]. There is no
254 consensus on how high correlations should be in order to demonstrate acceptable validity of a
255 physical activity questionnaire [30]. The same interpretation of correlations as mentioned above
256 is used for the validity of the Adapted-SQUASH. The level of significance was set at 0.05. Data
257 were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (IBM SPSS Statistics, version
258 24).

259

260 **Results**

261 A convenience sample of adults with disabilities (N=80) was approached. Finally, 68
262 participants were included in the test-retest reliability study and 58 in the validity study. Twelve
263 out of 80 participants were excluded from the test-retest reliability study because they did not
264 fill out the second questionnaire due to illness (N=1), surgery (N=1) or unknown reasons
265 (N=10). Based on the characteristics, the included and excluded sample only statistically
266 significantly differed in average body weight (see supplemental file). Body weight was on
267 average 89.8 ± 3.2 kg in the excluded sample and 79.1 ± 14.7 kg in the included sample. Based
268 on the criterion of a minimum of four days valid Actiheart accelerometer data, 22 out of 80
269 participants were excluded from the validity study. We included participants with four days
270 (N=5), five days (N=1), six days (N=6), and seven days (N=46) of valid Actiheart accelerometer
271 data, whereof all participants had at least three weekdays and one weekend day available. Based
272 on the characteristics, the included and excluded sample only significantly differed in the use
273 of mobility aid (see supplemental file). In the excluded sample, more people used a mobility
274 aid (32%) compared to the included sample (17%).

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

275 The characteristics of the participants for the test-retest reliability (N=68) and the
276 validity (N=58) studies are presented in Table 1. The Adapted-SQUASH was completed for a
277 second time after a mean period of 17 ± 4 days.

278

279 [Please insert table 1 here]

280

281 **Test-retest reliability**

282 The ICC for the repeated Adapted-SQUASH measurements was 0.67 ($p<0.001$) for the total
283 activity score, and 0.76 ($p<0.001$) for the total minutes of activity per week, which respectively
284 indicated a moderate to good and good to excellent agreement [25] (Table 2). Test-retest
285 reliability within the light, moderate and vigorous intensity categories were respectively 0.89
286 ($p<0.001$), 0.64 ($p<0.001$), and 0.32 ($p=0.004$). ICCs for the separate activity categories were:
287 0.39 ($p<0.001$) for commuting activities, 0.77 ($p<0.001$) for activities at work, 0.41 ($p<0.001$)
288 for household activities, and 0.44 ($p<0.001$) for leisure-time activities. Test-retest reliability of
289 the separate items of the questionnaire ranged from 0.00 for intense activities at work to 0.81
290 for walking during commuting (Table 2). Test-retest reliability of the new added items for
291 handcycling activities during commuting and leisure time and wheelchair riding during
292 commuting could not be determined because too few participants reported this activity. Test-
293 retest reliability for wheelchair riding in leisure time was 0.27 ($p=0.011$).

294

295 [Please insert table 2 here]

296

297 Bland-Altman analyses showed that the mean difference between the first and second
298 measurement was not significantly different from zero for both the total activity score ($t_{67}=-$
299 0.03, $p=0.98$) and for the total minutes of activity ($t_{67}=0.11$, $p=0.92$), indicating no systematic

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

300 bias between the two measurements. We found wide Limits of Agreement (LOA) with 95% of
301 the measurements of the total activity score within the boundaries of 4072 activity score above
302 and below the mean difference (Fig 1), and with 95% of the measurements of the total minutes
303 of activity within the boundaries of 945 minutes activity above and below the mean difference
304 (Fig 2). Besides, based on the Bland-Altman plots the absolute amount of time spent on physical
305 activity and the total activity score were higher at the second measurement occasion than at the
306 first measurement occasion, while the total activity score was lower at the second measurement
307 than at the first measurement occasion.

308

309 [Please insert figure 1 here]

310

311 [Please insert figure 2 here]

312

313 **Concurrent validity**

314 Correlation coefficients for the concurrent validity are presented in Table 3. A significant
315 Spearman correlation coefficient was found between the total activity score from the Adapted-
316 SQUASH and the AEE from the Actiheart ($\rho=0.40$, $p=0.002$). A significant ICC of 0.22 was
317 found between the total minutes of activity per week from the Adapted-SQUASH and the total
318 minutes of activity per week from the Actiheart ($p=0.027$). The correlation coefficients
319 indicated fair and little agreement, respectively. No significant ICCs were found between the
320 total minutes of light and moderate activity per week calculated with the Adapted-SQUASH
321 and Actiheart. Only a significant ICC of 0.21 ($p=0.046$) was found between the total minutes
322 of vigorous activity per week from the Adapted-SQUASH and Actiheart, indicating little
323 agreement between the two measurement tools.

324 Bland-Altman analysis showed that the mean difference between the total minutes of
325 activity calculated with the Adapted-SQUASH and Actiheart was significantly different from
326 zero ($t_{57}=3.48$, $p=0.001$), indicating systematic bias between the two. We found wide LOA with
327 95% of the measurements of the total minutes of activity within the boundaries of 1485 minutes
328 above and below the mean difference (Fig 3). Besides, based on the Bland-Altman plot the
329 absolute amount of time spent on physical activity was higher reported in the Adapted-
330 SQUASH questionnaire compared to physical activity assessed with the Actiheart.

331

332 [Please insert table 3 here]

333

334 Discussion

335 The current study showed good reproducibility of the Adapted SQUASH to assess self-reported
336 physical activity in populations of people with disabilities, but not at the individual level since
337 the Bland-Altman analyses found wide LOA. In addition, the current study showed fairly
338 acceptable validity of the Adapted SQUASH, but the Bland-Altman analysis showed wide
339 LOA, which indicates that self-reported physical activity individually assessed with the
340 Adapted-SQUASH does not accurately represent individually accelerometer-derived physical
341 activity assessed with the Actiheart in people with disabilities.

342

343 Test-retest reliability

344 The test-retest reliability of the total activity score per week ($ICC=0.67$, $p<.001$) of the Adapted-
345 SQUASH is slightly higher compared to the Spearman correlation coefficients found in studies
346 of the original SQUASH among 50 healthy adults ($\rho=0.58$) [4], among 44 patients after a total
347 hip arthroplasty ($\rho=0.57$) [13], but slightly lower compared to a study among 52 patients with

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

348 ankylosing spondylitis ($\rho=0.89$) [14]. Also, our result of the test-retest reliability of the total
349 minutes per week ($ICC=0.76$, $p<.001$) of the Adapted-SQUASH is comparable to the Spearman
350 correlation coefficient for the test-retest reliability of the PASIPD in similar populations with
351 a disability ($\rho=0.77$) [11]. A special note when comparing the test-retest reliability of our study
352 to others is that we examined the test-retest reliability by using ICCs, while others used
353 Spearman correlation coefficients [4,13,14]. ICCs give lower correlation coefficients compared
354 to Spearman correlation coefficients, because an ICC is the absolute agreement between the
355 first and second measurement, which does not correct for systematic differences. In accordance
356 with previous studies [13,14], the Bland-Altman analysis showed no systematic bias on total
357 activity scores between test and retest. Although the Adapted-SQUASH has good test-retest
358 reliability and the mean differences between the first and second measurement are close to zero,
359 relatively wide LOA are found for the total activity score and the total minutes of activity,
360 which indicated that the degree of repeatability is insufficient at the individual level and/or that
361 levels of physical activity fluctuate over time. Therefore, the Adapted-SQUASH can be used to
362 assess self-reported physical activity behaviour in large (patient) populations, but is not
363 acceptable to monitor individual physical activity levels. Also, it indicates that large changes in
364 the outcomes of the Adapted-SQUASH should be found when interested in the course of self-
365 reported physical activity over time (e.g. before and after an intervention or treatment).

366 The Adapted-SQUASH also calculated the total minutes of light, moderate and vigorous
367 activity per week. In previous literature, Wendel-Vos et al. (2003) and Wagenmakers et al.
368 (2008) found the highest Spearman correlation coefficient for the total minutes of vigorous
369 activity per week, respectively 0.92[4] and 0.85[13], while we found the lowest correlation for
370 the total minutes of vigorous activity per week ($ICC=0.32$, $p=.004$). Explanation of this
371 outcome is that vigorous intensity activities, such as weekly scheduled sports activities, are the
372 easiest to recall for healthy adults [31], while intermittent light intensity activities (e.g. walking)

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

373 are more difficult to recall [32,33]. However, adults with disabilities might experience activities
374 as more intense, since activities often cost more energy compared to healthy adults [16,17] and
375 may be more variable over the day due to fatigue and lack of appropriate pacing behaviour [34-
376 37]. Therefore, temporal fluctuation in light intensity activities in healthy adults, may be similar
377 to temporal fluctuation in moderate or vigorous intensity activities in our target population.
378 Furthermore, our sample reported less minutes of vigorous intensity activities (so a lower
379 between subjects' variance) compared to light intensity activities, which might give a lower
380 ICC.

381 The Adapted-SQUASH provides information of different settings of physical activity
382 (commuting activities, activities at work/school, household activities and leisure time activities
383 including different sports). We found low test-retest reliability for leisure-time activities, which
384 might be explained by the non-regular frequency of this type of activities per week, due to
385 barriers to physical activity such as the amount of leisure-time, tiredness, or bad weather
386 conditions [38]. The quite low correlation for intense activities at work could be due to a small
387 percentage of the population who can perform intense activities at work and the high variability
388 in vigorous activities. The two newly added items 'wheelchair riding' and 'handcycling' in the
389 Adapted-SQUASH had low response, because our study excluded people who were completely
390 wheelchair dependent. However, our study population did mention adapted sports in the
391 category 'sports activities' (e.g. wheelchair basketball).

392 Another interesting variable is the sport outcome measure indicating good test-retest
393 reliability (ICC=0.76, $p < 0.001$), probably because sports activities are often easy to recall, and
394 sports participation is a stable behaviour with scheduled regular practice. This variable is often
395 used in clinical settings, as well as in policy making and governmental guidelines worldwide.
396 Insight in sports activities can be used for a tailored advice regarding an active lifestyle during
397 or after rehabilitation, which has health-influencing effects, is crucial for quality of life,

398 mobility and participation in everyday life and is strongly recommended for adults with
399 disabilities [39].

400

401 **Concurrent validity**

402 The concurrent validity of the total activity score per week of the Adapted-SQUASH ($\rho=0.40$,
403 $p=.002$), when compared with the total AEE per week assessed with the Actiheart, is lower
404 compared to the Spearman correlation coefficients found in studies of the original SQUASH
405 among 50 healthy adults ($\rho=0.45$, physical activity was assessed with the computer science and
406 applications activity monitor) [4], among 44 patients after a total hip arthroplasty ($\rho=0.67$,
407 physical activity was assessed with an Actigraph accelerometer) [13], but higher compared to
408 a study among 52 patients with ankylosing spondylitis ($\rho=0.35$, physical activity was assessed
409 with an Actigraph accelerometer) [14]. Also, the concurrent validity of the total minutes of
410 activity per week of the Adapted-SQUASH ($ICC=0.22$, $p=.027$ and $\rho=0.36$, $p=.006$), when
411 compared with the total minutes of activity assessed with the Actiheart, is lower compared to
412 the Spearman correlation coefficient found in the study of the original SQUASH among 50
413 healthy adults ($\rho=0.56$) [4], but higher compared to the Spearman correlation coefficient for the
414 validity of the PASIPD among people with disabilities ($\rho=0.30$, physical activity was assessed
415 with an Actigraph accelerometer) [11]. The lower concurrent validity of physical activity
416 questionnaires in people with disabilities compared to healthy adults might be due to variation
417 of the questionnaire and variation of the standard. Also, cognitive function, which is sometimes
418 affected in people with disabilities, might influence the recall of activities and thereby might
419 explain the differences between self-reported and accelerometer-derived physical activity [32].

420 In addition, although the Bland-Altman analysis showed no systematic bias between the
421 total minutes of activity per week assessed with the Adapted-SQUASH and Actiheart, the LOA
422 were wide. This indicated that the Adapted-SQUASH does not accurately represent

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

423 accelerometer-derived physical activity assessed with the Actiheart in individuals with
424 disabilities. Previous literature also found that individual self-reported physical activity
425 compared to physical activity assessed with an accelerometer was not accurate in people after
426 joint arthroplasty [40] and in people with spinal cord injury [7]. Besides, the mean difference
427 between the Adapted-SQUASH and Actiheart was 346 minutes per week, which indicates that
428 people with disabilities seem to overestimate their self-reported physical activity assessed with
429 the Adapted-SQUASH compared to accelerometer-derived physical activity assessed with the
430 Actiheart. This is in agreement with previous literature [41-43]. This overestimation of actual
431 time spent being physically active is probably attributable to recall bias, such as the difficulty
432 in recalling short breaks during physical activity (e.g. socializing or refreshment during the
433 reported time doing sports, or taking rest during the reported time doing gardening or household
434 activities) [7], while the Actiheart does measure all sorts of short breaks during physical activity
435 and over the day. Another potential bias between self-reported and accelerometer-derived
436 physical activity outcomes may reside in the appreciation and perception of physical activities
437 and their intensities, which notions may be quite different in our population in the context of
438 their often low physical work capacity [44] and phenomena of fatigue during the day [35,36].
439 This introduces a difference in what one does and what one perceives.

440 Consequently, for the total minutes of vigorous activities per week low or little
441 agreement was found between the Adapted-SQUASH and Actiheart (ICC=0.21, p=.046), while
442 no agreement was found for the total minutes of light (ICC=0.05, p=.346) and moderate
443 (ICC=0.03, p=.401) activities per week. This suggests that the perceived intensity of activities
444 in people with disabilities is not in agreement with the accelerometer-derived intensities of
445 activities assessed with the Actiheart. Therefore, we suggest to use the total minutes of physical
446 activity per week assessed with the Adapted-SQUASH when interested in dose-response

447 relationships among for instance physical activity and health outcomes, or between physical
448 activity and the received intervention/treatment in people with disabilities.

449

450 **Limitations**

451 A few limitations need to be considered. First, the Adapted-SQUASH used MET values from
452 the Ainsworth compendium of physical activities, which were derived from and intended for
453 use in able-bodied adults [20]. This limitation could have overestimated the total activity score
454 for each intensity category [20,45], because our target population probably experiences
455 activities as more intense compared to healthy adults [16,17], as well as less consistent during
456 the day. Also, the Adapted-SQUASH is sensitive to overestimation of frequency and/or
457 duration of the activities, due to recall bias. A more or less similar limitation is however true
458 for the Actiheart device, where the used sensor algorithms are not specific to people with
459 disabilities, but have been derived from the general healthy population [23,24]. This stresses
460 the need for more population-specific validation studies also of objective physical activity
461 measurement tools in the future [46].

462 Thirdly, the test-retest period was on average seventeen days. This duration could be
463 too short to prevent participants from copying the Adapted-SQUASH from memory. However,
464 following the recommendations of Matthews et al. (2012), we have consciously chosen for this
465 short recall period to decrease the reporting error of activities, since physical activity levels tend
466 to fluctuate between days and weeks due to weather conditions [47] and/or due to fluctuating
467 experienced health or fatigue conditions among this population of persons with a disability [37].
468 Furthermore, we did not check at the participant if the week the Actiheart was worn was a
469 representative week of their physical activity behaviour.

470 Lastly, the Actiheart is a device capable of measuring heart rate and acceleration, and
471 combines these variables in a branched equation model to calculate AEE [23,24]. However, we

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

472 found a large amount of missing heart rate data in our sample, while calculating AEE based on
473 the heart rate and combined algorithm is preferred [24]. The median percentage of missing heart
474 rate was 22% (inter quartile range: 10% - 42%). The unsuccessful measurement of heart rate
475 may have happened due to malfunction of the battery or the electrodes. However, if during the
476 week participants felt that the electrodes loosened or if the electrodes had not been replaced by
477 the fourth day, the instruction was given to replace the electrodes. As stated above another
478 limitation is that the algorithm from the Actiheart to calculate AEE has not been validated
479 among adults with deviating movement patterns and adults using drugs against high blood
480 pressure, who are included in our target population. This is however the case for most of the
481 activity monitor devices currently available [48].

482

483 **Practical implications and further research**

484 The Adapted-SQUASH provides information on various dimensions (frequency, duration and
485 intensity) and settings (e.g. household, leisure time), is inexpensive, and has low burden for
486 participants to fill in. Together this turns the Adapted-SQUASH into a useful tool to assess self-
487 reported physical activity among adults with disabilities in large population studies. Firstly, the
488 Adapted-SQUASH can be used in community and health-care settings, like rehabilitation
489 centres, to monitor physical activity levels in large heterogeneous populations with disabilities.
490 For this practical use, the Adapted-SQUASH is distinctive compared with other physical
491 activity questionnaires (e.g. PASIPD), because even though the questionnaire specifically
492 assesses type, frequency and intensity of activities, it is short and quick to fill in and it includes
493 physical activities for wheelchair users and adapted sports. Secondly, the Adapted-SQUASH
494 can be used for large longitudinal cohort studies or intervention studies to evaluate self-reported
495 physical activity. For example, the Adapted-SQUASH has already been used in the longitudinal
496 cohort study ReSpAct, which aimed to evaluate physical activity in people with disabilities

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

497 during and after a physical activity stimulation programme [8,9]. When accurate and complete
498 measures of physical activity are preferred in further research among large populations with
499 disabilities, we suggest using both the Adapted-SQUASH (in the total sample) and an activity
500 monitor (in a sub-sample). The Adapted-SQUASH provides information on the setting of the
501 activity, while an activity monitor provides information on intermittent activities (e.g. walking
502 at home and taking rest during activities) [7,33]. So, selection of the best measurement to assess
503 physical activity depends on the purpose, construct, measurement unit, population, setting etc.
504 [6].

505 For practical implications, we recommend using the total minutes of activity per week
506 or the total activity score, which were the two main outcome measures of the Adapted-
507 SQUASH, to assess self-reported physical activity in people with disabilities. The test-retest
508 reliability of the total minutes of activity per week was good but systematic bias with the
509 Actiheart was found. The test-retest reliability of the total activity score per week was lower
510 and the perceived intensity of activities (light, moderate and vigorous) was not in agreement
511 with the Actiheart. However, outcomes should be interpreted with caution since our sample of
512 people with disabilities overestimated their physical activity. Also, for future research it is
513 recommended to assess the validity and test-retest reliability of the Adapted-SQUASH among
514 people who are completely wheelchair dependent.

515

516 **Conclusion**

517 The Adapted-SQUASH is an acceptable measure to assess self-reported physical activity in
518 large populations of people with disabilities but is not applicable at the individual level due to
519 the wide LOA. Self-reported physical activity assessed with the Adapted-SQUASH does not
520 accurately represent accelerometer-derived physical activity assessed with the Actiheart in
521 individuals with disabilities. They seem to overestimate their physical activity and find it

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

522 difficult to recall the perceived intensity of the activity. The test-retest reliability and concurrent
523 validity of the Adapted-SQUASH are comparable to other physical activity questionnaires
524 among people with disabilities. We recommend using the total minutes of activity per week
525 and/or total activity score, derived from the Adapted-SQUASH, to evaluate physical activity in
526 large populations of people with disabilities in rehabilitation practice and (cohort) research.

527

528 **Acknowledgements**

529 The authors wish to thank the participating subjects and the students in the bachelor and master
530 Human Movement Sciences at the University of Groningen who contributed to the data
531 collection. The authors would like to thank Leonie A. Krops for her critical reading and
532 comments on a draft of the manuscript.

533

534 **Declaration of interest**

535 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest or financial disclosures. This study is
536 funded by Stichting Beatrixoord Noord-Nederland and a personal grant received from the
537 University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen (grant date 1-9-2018).

538

539 **References**

- 540 1. van der Ploeg HP, van der Beek AJ, van der Woude LH, van Mechelen W. Physical activity
541 for people with a disability: a conceptual model. *Sports Med* 2004;34(10):639-649.
- 542 2. Booth M. Assessment of physical activity: an international perspective. *Res Q Exerc Sport*
543 2000 Jun;71(2 Suppl):S114-20.
- 544 3. Cervantes CM, Porretta DL. Physical activity measurement among individuals with
545 disabilities: a literature review. *Adapt Phys Activ Q* 2010 Jul;27(3):173-190.

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

- 546 4. Wendel-Vos GC, Schuit AJ, Saris WH, Kromhout D. Reproducibility and relative validity
547 of the short questionnaire to assess health-enhancing physical activity. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003
548 Dec;56(12):1163-1169.
- 549 5. Rennie KL, Wareham NJ. The validation of physical activity instruments for measuring
550 energy expenditure: problems and pitfalls. *Public Health Nutr* 1998 Dec;1(4):265-271.
- 551 6. Nigg CR, Fuchs R, Gerber M, Jekauc D, Koch T, Krell-Roesch J, et al. Assessing physical
552 activity through questionnaires - A consensus of best practices and future directions.
553 *Psychology of Sport & Exercise* 2020.
- 554 7. Ma JK, McCracken LA, Voss C, Chan FHN, West CR, Martin Ginis KA. Physical activity
555 measurement in people with spinal cord injury: comparison of accelerometry and self-report
556 (the Physical Activity Recall Assessment for People with Spinal Cord Injury). *Disabil Rehabil*
557 2020 Jan;42(2):240-246.
- 558 8. Hoekstra F, Alingh RA, van der Schans CP, Hettinga FJ, Duijf M, Dekker R, et al. Design
559 of a process evaluation of the implementation of a physical activity and sports stimulation
560 programme in Dutch rehabilitation setting: ReSpAct. *Implement Sci* 2014 Sep 20;9:127-014-
561 0127-7.
- 562 9. Alingh RA, Hoekstra F, van der Schans CP, Hettinga FJ, Dekker R, van der Woude LH.
563 Protocol of a longitudinal cohort study on physical activity behaviour in physically disabled
564 patients participating in a rehabilitation counselling programme: ReSpAct. *BMJ Open* 2015 Jan
565 29;5(1):e007591-2015-007591.
- 566 10. Hoekstra F, Hoekstra T, van der Schans CP, Hettinga FJ, van der Woude LHV, Dekker R,
567 et al. The implementation of a physical activity counseling program in rehabilitation care:
568 findings from the ReSpAct study. *Disabil Rehabil* 2019 Oct 17:1-12.
- 569 11. van der Ploeg HP, Streppel KR, van der Beek AJ, van der Woude LH, Vollenbroek-Hutten
570 M, van Mechelen W. The Physical Activity Scale for Individuals with Physical Disabilities:

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

- 571 test-retest reliability and comparison with an accelerometer. *J Phys Act Health* 2007
572 Jan;4(1):96-100.
- 573 12. Prince SA, Adamo KB, Hamel ME, Hardt J, Connor Gorber S, Tremblay M. A comparison
574 of direct versus self-report measures for assessing physical activity in adults: a systematic
575 review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2008 Nov 6;5:56-5868-5-56.
- 576 13. Wagenmakers R, van den Akker-Scheek I, Groothoff JW, Zijlstra W, Bulstra SK, Kootstra
577 JW, et al. Reliability and validity of the short questionnaire to assess health-enhancing physical
578 activity (SQUASH) in patients after total hip arthroplasty. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2008
579 Oct 17;9:141-2474-9-141.
- 580 14. Arends S, Hofman M, Kamsma YP, van der Veer E, Houtman PM, Kallenberg CG, et al.
581 Daily physical activity in ankylosing spondylitis: validity and reliability of the IPAQ and
582 SQUASH and the relation with clinical assessments. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2013 Aug
583 23;15(4):R99.
- 584 15. Dawes HN, Barker KL, Cockburn J, Roach N, Scott O, Wade D. Borg's rating of perceived
585 exertion scales: do the verbal anchors mean the same for different clinical groups? *Arch Phys*
586 *Med Rehabil* 2005 May;86(5):912-916.
- 587 16. Waters RL, Mulroy S. The energy expenditure of normal and pathologic gait. *Gait Posture*
588 1999 Jul;9(3):207-231.
- 589 17. Wezenberg D, van der Woude LH, Faber WX, de Haan A, Houdijk H. Relation between
590 aerobic capacity and walking ability in older adults with a lower-limb amputation. *Arch Phys*
591 *Med Rehabil* 2013 Sep;94(9):1714-1720.
- 592 18. Strath SJ, Bassett DR, Jr, Swartz AM, Thompson DL. Simultaneous heart rate-motion sensor
593 technique to estimate energy expenditure. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001 Dec;33(12):2118-2123.

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

- 594 19. Klaren RE, Hubbard EA, Zhu W, Motl RW. Reliability of Accelerometer Scores for
595 Measuring Sedentary and Physical Activity Behaviors in Persons With Multiple Sclerosis.
596 *Adapt Phys Activ Q* 2016 Apr;33(2):195-204.
- 597 20. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Herrmann SD, Meckes N, Bassett DR,Jr, Tudor-Locke C, et
598 al. 2011 Compendium of Physical Activities: a second update of codes and MET values. *Med*
599 *Sci Sports Exerc* 2011 Aug;43(8):1575-1581.
- 600 21. Conger SA, Bassett DR. A compendium of energy costs of physical activities for individuals
601 who use manual wheelchairs. *Adapt Phys Activ Q* 2011 Oct;28(4):310-325.
- 602 22. Hildebrandt V, Ooijendijk W, Stiggelhout M. Trendrapport bewegen en gezondheid
603 1998/1999. 1999;p. 23-9.
- 604 23. Brage S, Brage N, Franks PW, Ekelund U, Wareham NJ. Reliability and validity of the
605 combined heart rate and movement sensor Actiheart. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2005 Apr;59(4):561-570.
- 606 24. Crouter SE, Churilla JR, Bassett DR,Jr. Accuracy of the Actiheart for the assessment of
607 energy expenditure in adults. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2008 Jun;62(6):704-711.
- 608 25. Cicchetti DV. Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and
609 standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment* 1994;6(4):284-
610 290.
- 611 26. Portney LG, Watkins MP. *Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to Practice*. :
612 Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall; 2009.
- 613 27. Bland JM, Altman DG. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Stat Methods*
614 *Med Res* 1999 Jun;8(2):135-160.
- 615 28. Giavarina D. Understanding Bland Altman analysis. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* 2015 Jun
616 5;25(2):141-151.
- 617 29. Vet HCWd, Terwee CB, Mokkink LB, Knol DL. *Measurement in medicine : a practical*
618 *guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

- 619 30. Terwee CB, Mokkink LB, van Poppel MN, Chinapaw MJ, van Mechelen W, de Vet HC.
620 Qualitative attributes and measurement properties of physical activity questionnaires: a
621 checklist. *Sports Med* 2010 Jul 1;40(7):525-537.
- 622 31. Jacobs DR,Jr, Ainsworth BE, Hartman TJ, Leon AS. A simultaneous evaluation of 10
623 commonly used physical activity questionnaires. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1993 Jan;25(1):81-91.
- 624 32. Herbolzheimer F, Riepe MW, Peter R. Cognitive function and the agreement between self-
625 reported and accelerometer-accessed physical activity. *BMC Geriatr* 2018 Feb 21;18(1):56-
626 018-0747-x.
- 627 33. Skender S, Ose J, Chang-Claude J, Paskow M, BrÃ¼hmann B, Siegel EM, et al.
628 Accelerometry and physical activity questionnaires - a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*
629 2016 Jun 16;16:515-016-3172-0.
- 630 34. Murphy SL, Kratz AL. Activity pacing in daily life: A within-day analysis. *Pain* 2014
631 Dec;155(12):2630-2637.
- 632 35. Rimmer JH, Chen MD, Hsieh K. A conceptual model for identifying, preventing, and
633 managing secondary conditions in people with disabilities. *Phys Ther* 2011 Dec;91(12):1728-
634 1739.
- 635 36. Martin Ginis KA, Ma JK, Latimer-Cheung AE, Rimmer JH. A systematic review of review
636 articles addressing factors related to physical activity participation among children and adults
637 with physical disabilities. *Health Psychol Rev* 2016 Dec;10(4):478-494.
- 638 37. Abonie US, Edwards AM, Hettinga FJ. Optimising activity pacing to promote a physically
639 active lifestyle in medical settings: A narrative review informed by clinical and sports pacing
640 research. *J Sports Sci* 2020 Mar;38(5):590-596.
- 641 38. King AC. Intervention strategies and determinants of physical activity and exercise behavior
642 in adult and older adult men and women. *World Rev Nutr Diet* 1997;82:148-158.

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

- 643 39. Haskell WL, Lee IM, Pate RR, Powell KE, Blair SN, Franklin BA, et al. Physical activity
644 and public health: updated recommendation for adults from the American College of Sports
645 Medicine and the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2007 Aug 28;116(9):1081-1093.
- 646 40. Vaughn NH, Dunklebarger MF, Mason MW. Individual Patient-reported Activity Levels
647 Before and After Joint Arthroplasty Are Neither Accurate nor Reproducible. *Clin Orthop Relat*
648 *Res* 2019 Mar;477(3):536-544.
- 649 41. Feuering R, Vered E, Kushnir T, Jette AM, Melzer I. Differences between self-reported and
650 observed physical functioning in independent older adults. *Disabil Rehabil* 2014;36(17):1395-
651 1401.
- 652 42. Chinapaw MJ, Sloopmaker SM, Schuit AJ, van Zuidam M, van Mechelen W. Reliability
653 and validity of the Activity Questionnaire for Adults and Adolescents (AQuAA). *BMC Med*
654 *Res Methodol* 2009 Aug 10;9:58-2288-9-58.
- 655 43. Sebastiao E, Gobbi S, Chodzko-Zajko W, Schwingel A, Papini CB, Nakamura PM, et al.
656 The International Physical Activity Questionnaire-long form overestimates self-reported
657 physical activity of Brazilian adults. *Public Health* 2012 Nov;126(11):967-975.
- 658 44. Carroll DD, Courtney-Long EA, Stevens AC, Sloan ML, Lullo C, Visser SN, et al. Vital
659 signs: disability and physical activity--United States, 2009-2012. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
660 *Rep* 2014 May 9;63(18):407-413.
- 661 45. Rikli RE. Reliability, validity, and methodological issues in assessing physical activity in
662 older adults. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2000 Jun;71(2 Suppl):S89-96.
- 663 46. Lankhorst K, Oerbekke M, van den Berg-Emons R, Takken T, de Groot J. Instruments
664 Measuring Physical Activity in Individuals Who Use a Wheelchair: A Systematic Review of
665 Measurement Properties. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2020 Mar;101(3):535-552.

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

- 666 47. Matthews CE, Moore SC, George SM, Sampson J, Bowles HR. Improving self-reports of
667 active and sedentary behaviors in large epidemiologic studies. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 2012
668 Jul;40(3):118-126.
- 669 48. Van Remoortel H, Giavedoni S, Raste Y, Burtin C, Louvaris Z, Gimeno-Santos E, et al.
670 Validity of activity monitors in health and chronic disease: a systematic review. *Int J Behav*
671 *Nutr Phys Act* 2012 Jul 9;9:84-5868-9-84.
- 672

673 **Tables**

674 **Table 1 Characteristics of the participants for the test-retest reliability study (N=68) and the validity study**
675 **(N=58)**

	Test-retest reliability study (N=68)	Validity study (N=58)
	Mean±SD or N(%)	Mean±SD or N(%)
Gender (% male)	31 (46)	27 (47)
Age (years)	56.9 ± 17.6	54.7 ± 18.7
Body height (m)	1.73 ± 0.10	1.74 ± 0.09
Body weight (kg)	79.1 ± 14.7	80.8 ± 14.3
Body Mass Index (kg/m ²)	26.6 ± 4.7	26.7 ± 4.5
Drug use (% yes)	60 (88)	48 (83)
Use of mobility aid (% yes)	17 (25)	10 (17)
Diagnosis		
Musculoskeletal disease	2 (3)	2 (3)
Brain disorder	22 (32)	15 (26)
Neurologic disease	5 (7)	5 (9)
Organ disease	31 (46)	29 (50)
Other diseases ^a	6 (9)	7 (12)

SD=standard deviation, N=number of participants

^a E.g. Ménière's disease, Hereditary Motor and Sensory Neuropathy type II, worn neck vertebrae, low-back pain.

676

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

677 **Table 2 Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) between the first and second measurement of the Adapted-**
678 **SQUASH (N=68)**

	Physical activity levels		Test-retest reliability		
	First test Median (IQR)	Second test Median (IQR)	ICC	95%CI	p
Main outcomes					
Total activity score ^a	1706 (658 – 4151)	1950 (900 – 3864)	.67	.51-.78	<.001
Total minutes of activity/week	379 (189 – 861)	473 (246 – 939)	.76	.64-.85	<.001
Intensity categories (min/week)					
Light	86 (30 – 233)	90 (30 – 278)	.89	.83-.93	<.001
Moderate	68 (3 – 308)	119 (30 – 366)	.64	.48-.76	<.001
Vigorous	53 (30 – 131)	78 (30 – 135)	.32	.09-.51	.004
Item activity scores^a					
Commuting	0 (0 – 10)	0 (0 – 15)	.39	.17-.57	<.001
Walking	0 (0 – 0)	0 (0 – 0)	.81	.72-.88	<.001
Bicycling	0 (0 – 8)	0 (0 – 0)	.29	.06-.50	.007
Handcycling	0 (0 – 0)	0 (0 – 0)		NA	
Wheelchair riding	0 (0 – 0)	0 (0 – 0)		NA	
Activities at work	0 (0 – 705)	0 (0 – 525)	.77	.65-.85	<.001
Light	0 (0 – 705)	0 (0 – 450)	.78	.67-.86	<.001
Vigorous	0 (0 – 0)	0 (0 – 0)	.00	-.24-.24	.499
Household activities	53 (21 – 116)	54 (16 – 112)	.41	.20-.59	<.001
Light	45 (16 – 60)	33 (15 – 75)	.43	.21-.61	<.001
Vigorous	0 (0 – 15)	0 (0 – 30)	.20	-.03-.42	.044
Leisure time	136 (73 – 238)	178 (91 – 244)	.44	.23-.61	<.001
Walking	19 (0 – 45)	21 (8 – 45)	.21	-.03-.42	.046
Bicycling	15 (0 – 30)	24 (0 – 38)	.15	-.09-.38	.110
Handcycling	0 (0 – 0)	0 (0 – 0)		NA	
Wheelchair riding	0 (0 – 0)	0 (0 – 0)	.27	.04-.48	.011
Gardening	0 (0 – 28)	0 (0 – 30)	.19	-.05-.41	.059
Odd jobs	0 (0 – 6)	0 (0 – 26)	.50	.30-.66	<.001
Sports	45 (0 – 105)	45 (23 – 105)	.76	.64-.85	<.001

IQR=Inter Quartile Range, ICC=Intraclass Correlation Coefficient, CI=Confidence Interval, NA=not applicable due to too low response on this item.

^a Activity score = minutes x intensity

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH

680 **Table 3 Correlation coefficients between the first measurement of the Adapted-SQUASH and the Actiheart**
681 (N=58)

Outcomes Adapted-SQUASH	Physical activity levels		Concurrent validity		
	First test Median (IQR)	Actiheart ^b Median (IQR)	r_{spearman}	p	
Total activity score ^a	1903 (958 – 4260)	49 (26 – 74)	.40		.002
Total minutes of activity/week	454 (231 – 1073)	341 (106 – 727)	.36		.006
			ICC	95%CI	p
Total minutes of activity/week	454 (231 – 1073)	341 (106 – 727)	.22	-.01-.44	.027
Total minutes of light activity/week	83 (43 – 369)	223 (91 - 548)	.05	-.21-.31	.346
Total minutes of moderate activity/week	101 (0 – 371)	31 (10 – 114)	.03	-.17-.24	.401
Total minutes of vigorous activity/week	60 (30 – 136)	27 (10 – 92)	.21	-.03-.43	.046


IQR=Inter Quartile Range, ICC=Intraclass Correlation Coefficient, CI=Confidence Interval; p<0.05: significantly different from zero.

^a Activity score = minutes x intensity

^b Values are in total minutes per week, only the total activity score of the Adapted-SQUASH is compared with activity energy expenditure in kcal $\text{kg}^{-1}\text{min}^{-1}$.


682

683 Figures




684
685 **Fig 1. The differences between the total activity scores on the first and second measurement of the Adapted-**
686 **SQUASH, plotted against their mean for each participant, together with the 95% confidence interval (CI)**
687 **and the 95% Limits of Agreement (LOA) (N=68).**

Reliability and validity of the Adapted-SQUASH



688

689 Fig 2. The differences between the total minutes of activity on the first and second measurement of the
690 Adapted-SQUASH, plotted against their mean for each participant, together with the 95% confidence
691 interval (CI) and the 95% Limits of Agreement (LOA) (N=68).



692

693 Fig 3. The differences between the total minutes of activity calculated with the Adapted-SQUASH and
694 Actiheart, plotted against their mean for each participant, together with the 95% confidence interval (CI)
695 and the 95% Limits of Agreement (LOA). (N=58).