

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Validation of the *Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4 (MPAI-4)* and reference norms in a French-Canadian population with traumatic brain injury receiving rehabilitation

Marie-Claude Guerrette, M.A., and Michelle McKerral, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology, Université de Montréal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, and
Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation of Greater Montreal-IURDPM, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Author note

This research was supported by a graduate scholarship from the Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé (FRQS) to Marie-Claude Guerrette and by a research grant from the Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé (FRQS) to Michelle McKerral [grant number 254599].

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Marie-Claude Guerrette and Michelle McKerral, Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation of Greater Montreal-IURDPM, Lindsay Pavilion, 6363 Hudson Road, Montreal, Quebec, H3S 1M9, Canada. Email: marie-claude.guerrette@umontreal.ca, michelle.mckerral@umontreal.ca.

23 Validation of the *Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4 (MPAI-4)* and reference norms in a
24 French-Canadian population with traumatic brain injury receiving rehabilitation

25 **Abstract**

26 **Objective:** To validate the factor structure and establish internal consistency reliability of the
27 French-Canadian version of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI-4), using a
28 Canadian sample of adults with traumatic brain injury (TBI) receiving post-acute rehabilitation
29 services.

30 **Design:** Psychometric analysis of prospectively collected French-Canadian MPAI-4 data.

31 **Setting:** Inpatient and outpatient TBI rehabilitation programs.

32 **Participants:** Adults ($N = 1012$) with a mild, moderate or severe TBI who received inpatient or
33 outpatient rehabilitation interventions and for whom a first French-Canadian MPAI-4 measure
34 was completed between 2016 and 2020.

35 **Interventions:** Not applicable.

36 **Main Outcome Measure:** French-Canadian MPAI-4 questionnaire.

37 **Results:** To evaluate the factor structure of the French-Canadian MPAI-4, an exploratory factor
38 analysis using a varimax rotation method was conducted on z-scores for all items. The final and
39 best solution was a three-factor solution, which accounted for 48.68% of the variance. The
40 internal consistency of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 was determined using Cronbach's alpha
41 and all three subscales showed good internal consistency (all $.70 \leq \alpha \leq .89$). Reference norms for
42 the TBI sample are provided in the form of T scores for subscales and total score, as well as
43 descriptive raw data according to sex, age, TBI severity and rehabilitation setting.

44 **Conclusions:** The three factors extracted using data from the French-Canadian MPAI-4 are
45 similar, but not entirely identical to the three subscales of the original MPAI-4. Overall, the

VALIDATION OF THE FRENCH-CANADIAN MPAI-4

3

46 French-Canadian MPAI-4 factor structure is validated. The questionnaire shows good
47 psychometric properties and represents a suitable tool to measure functional evolution and social
48 participation of TBI adults receiving rehabilitation services in a French-Canadian context. The
49 provided reference norms will also help guide the clinical use of the MPAI-4 in French-Canadian
50 TBI populations.

51 **Key Words:** Traumatic Brain Injury; Rehabilitation; Outcome Assessment (Health Care); Social
52 Participation; Psychometrics, Validation Study.

53 **List of abbreviations:** Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA); Mayo-Portland Adaptability
54 Inventory-4 (MPAI-4); Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI).

55

56 Traumatic brain injury (TBI) is the leading cause of death and disability across the world
57 and consists of a serious health problem.¹ It also remains a complex medical condition because
58 patients are at high risk of having long-lasting physical, cognitive or behavioural sequelae that
59 may impact their social integration or vocational recovery. Therefore, the use of standardized,
60 valid and reliable tools that measures sequelae and help professionals identify functional
61 impairment and predict the outcome is necessary,² such as during the assessment following TBI.
62 However, considering the complexity and heterogeneity of TBI sequelae, there are few available
63 tools that measure TBI impairments and participation levels, as most of the accessible
64 measurement tools are generic and not specific to TBI.³⁻⁵

65 One measurement tool commonly used by rehabilitation professionals working with TBI
66 population is the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4 questionnaire (MPAI-4),⁶ developed
67 in the United States of America. Lezak⁷ produced the initial Portland Adaptability Inventory
68 (PAI), which was refined by Malec and Thompson⁸ and renamed the Mayo-Portland
69 Adaptability Inventory (MPAI). Over the years, the MPAI was further modified to maximize its
70 internal consistency and reliability (for example, see Malec et al.⁹), resulting in its most recent
71 version, the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory, 4th revision (MPAI-4).⁶ The MPAI-4
72 questionnaire was broadly designed to assess functional abilities, global outcome and community
73 integration by covering a wide range of physical, cognitive, emotional, behavioural and social
74 problems that TBI patients may experience following their brain injury.

75 The MPAI-4 is a 30-item questionnaire measuring the patient's magnitude of
76 impairments. The 30 items are divided into three subscales (i.e. Ability, Adjustment,
77 Participation), with some overlap in categories. The Ability index consists of 13 items measuring
78 mobility, hand function, vision, hearing, dizziness, motor speech, verbal and nonverbal

79 communication, attention and concentration, memory, information retrieval, problem solving and
80 visuospatial abilities. The Adjustment index, with 12 items, assesses anxiety, depression,
81 irritability and anger or aggression, pain and headaches, fatigue, sensitivity to mild symptoms,
82 inappropriate social interactions, impaired self-awareness, family and significant relationships,
83 initiative, social contact, and leisure and recreational activities. The Participation index, with 8
84 items, measures initiative, social contact, leisure and recreational activities (i.e. the latter three
85 items contribute to both the Adjustment index and the Participation index), self-care,
86 independent living, independent use of transportation, employment status and financial
87 management. Each item is scored on a 5-point scale (from 0 to 4), with higher score indicating
88 greater clinical impairment. Each subscale evaluates different aspects of TBI sequelae, and the
89 subscales can be used separately or combined in a total MPAI-4 score, reflecting the general
90 level of adaptation and social participation.

91 The MPAI-4 questionnaire is now extensively used worldwide in inpatient, outpatient and
92 vocational rehabilitation settings to measure TBI patients' progress and outcomes.¹⁰⁻¹⁴ The
93 multifaceted structure of the MPAI-4 makes it a useful tool for planning and assessing
94 interventions, and studies have demonstrated the MPAI-4's clinical sensitivity to the effect of
95 rehabilitation.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ The MPAI-4 is best completed by consensus of the rehabilitation team, but
96 can be completed by caregivers, significant others or by the patients themselves. For example,
97 Malec¹⁸ compared MPAI-4 scores between rehabilitation professionals, significant others and
98 TBI patients, which revealed satisfactory internal consistency and interrater agreement. Finally,
99 the MPAI-4 is among the recommended Common Data Elements Project for TBI adults, and an
100 emerging measure for youth with TBI.^{19,20} It is also a recommended participation measure in the
101 INESSS-ONF Clinical Practice Guidelines following moderate and severe TBI.²¹

102 Using Rasch analysis, item clusters, principal component analyses and other traditional
103 psychometric measures, numerous studies provided further evidence of satisfactory internal
104 consistency,^{9,16,22} construct validity,^{9,16,17,23} as well as predictive and concurrent validity^{8,23–28} for
105 the full MPAI-4 measure and its subscales. Moreover, the MPAI-4 also proved itself to be a
106 useful measure of global outcome for patients following a stroke.^{29,30}

107 Overall, given its clinical usefulness, comprehensiveness and good psychometric
108 properties, the MPAI-4 questionnaire was translated into other languages, notably French,
109 Danish, Spanish, German, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish and Dutch. However, aside from the
110 original MPAI-4, psychometric properties have only been established for the Italian⁴ and
111 Arabic³¹ versions of the MPAI-4. Thus, the objective of this paper was to validate the factor
112 structure and establish internal consistency reliability of the French-Canadian MPAI-4, using a
113 Canadian sample of TBI adults receiving post-acute rehabilitation services in a French-speaking
114 environment. A secondary aim was to provide a set of French-Canadian MPAI-4 reference
115 norms for TBI to guide clinical use.

116 **Methods**

117 **French-Canadian version of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4**

118 With the permission and collaboration of the MPAI-4's author (James F. Malec), the
119 questionnaire was translated into French and adapted to a French-Canadian cultural context. The
120 original MPAI-4 questionnaire was translated into French by a professional scientific translator
121 and was then back-translated into English. The two versions were then submitted to an expert
122 multidisciplinary clinical team for review (neuropsychologist, occupational therapist,
123 physiotherapist, social worker) in order to choose the most appropriate terms in French for
124 describing the different MPAI-4 items. The resulting version was then submitted to a second

125 panel of clinicians (neuropsychologist, occupational therapist) for final validation of the French-
126 Canadian questionnaire's terminology. The resulting French-Canadian version of the MPAI-4
127 and its user's manual can be found on the COMBI website.³²⁻³⁴

128 **Procedure and Participants**

129 Between 2014 and 2017, the French-Canadian MPAI-4 was implemented in the clinical
130 practice of four rehabilitation centres in the greater Montreal region. Since 2016, for every TBI
131 patient receiving post-acute rehabilitation services, the MPAI-4 is completed by team consensus
132 at the beginning of inpatient rehabilitation, and at the beginning and end of outpatient
133 rehabilitation. For the purpose of this study, all patients' first MPAI-4 measure (at intake either
134 for inpatient or outpatient rehabilitation) was used in the analysis. Eligible patients ($N = 1020$)
135 were TBI adults participating in a TBI rehabilitation program at one of the four rehabilitation
136 centres, and for whom at least a first MPAI-4 measure was completed between 2016 and 2020.
137 Data from 1012 of these patients were included in the final analyses. The patients'
138 sociodemographic and clinical characteristics are presented in Table 1. Ethical approval for
139 collecting patients' MPAI-4 scores, sociodemographic and clinical characteristics was obtained
140 from each rehabilitation centre's research ethics board.

141 -----
142 Approximate position for Table 1
143 -----

144 **Statistical Analysis**

145 An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using orthogonal (varimax) rotation method was
146 used to evaluate the construct validity of the French-Canadian MPAI-4. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
147 (KMO) measure verified the sampling adequacy for the EFA and the Bartlett's test of sphericity

148 was used to assess the degree of inter-correlation between variables. Analyzed matrices
149 (correlation, anti-image and reproduced correlations) are available upon request. Factors were
150 selected if the eigenvalue was > 1 as suggested by Kaiser³⁵ and the number of factors was
151 validated by inspection of the scree plot^{36,37} with clinical consideration for coherence and
152 interpretability of the factors. Appropriate for our sample size, conservative cutoffs of .20 on
153 loading values were applied for statistical significance of an item³⁸ and items with loading values
154 $\geq .40$ were included in the interpretation of a factor.^{36,37} The internal consistency of the French-
155 Canadian MPAI-4 was determined using Cronbach's alpha. For all analyses, the level of
156 significance was .05 using 95% confidence intervals. Finally, French-Canadian reference norms
157 were developed for the MPAI-4 total score and subscales by converting raw scores into
158 standardized T scores (Mean = 50; SD = 10). Means and SD were also computed on raw MPAI-
159 4 data according to sex, age, TBI severity and rehabilitation setting. Analyses were conducted
160 using IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh version 26.0 (2019).

161 **Results**

162 Prior to the factor analysis, raw MPAI-4 scores were examined for accuracy of data entry,
163 missing values, outliers and fit between data distribution and the assumptions of multivariate
164 analyses. The variables were examined separately for all participants. No missing values were
165 found. No extremely low or high z-scores were found to be univariate outliers, but eight cases
166 were identified as multivariate outliers using Mahalanobis distance ($p < .001$). The eight
167 participants were removed. The final sample size of 1012 participants is adequate for factor
168 analysis according to literature guidelines.³⁹

169

170 **Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)**

171 Before conducting the factor analysis on the full sample, participants were randomly
172 divided into two groups. Exploratory factor analyses (EFA) with varimax rotation methods were
173 performed separately on z-scores from both groups. The number of extracted factors, factor
174 loadings for individual items as well as proportion of variance explained by each factor was
175 similar between groups. The random samples were therefore combined and the EFA was
176 performed on the whole sample. The EFA with varimax rotation method was performed on z-
177 scores for the 30 items of the French-Canadian MPAI-4. The overall KMO was .93 and all KMO
178 value for individual items were larger than or equal to .76, which is above the acceptable limit of
179 .50.³⁶ Bartlett's test of sphericity, $\chi^2_{(435)} = 14188.20, p = .000$, indicated that correlations between
180 items were sufficiently large to conduct an EFA.³⁶ Five factors had eigenvalues superior to
181 Kaiser's³⁵ criterion of 1, but the scree plot (see Figure 1) showed inflections that would justify
182 retaining only three factors. Subsequent factor analyses on three-factor varimax and oblimin
183 rotation solutions revealed little difference. Owing to parsimony, interpretability of factors and
184 consistency with the factor structure of the original MPAI-4, a three-factor solution with a
185 varimax rotation method was thus preferred.

186 -----
187 Approximate position for Figure 1
188 -----

189 The final solution accounted for 48.68% of the variance. Communalities, factor loading
190 values and percent of variance for the final solution are presented in Table 2. Items are ordered
191 by their item number to facilitate interpretation. Items allocated to a specific factor were based
192 on loading value $\geq .20$ on that factor. A total of 20 items in the final solution also had loading

193 values $\geq .20$ on multiple factors, but those items had a higher primary loading value on their
194 assigned factor. Only one of 30 items failed to have a primary factor loading value $\geq .20$ on any
195 factor (item 4). Failure to load on a factor reflects the homogeneity of participants' responses on
196 that specific item, resulting in less variability and positively skewed data. Additional EFAs after
197 eliminating cross-loading items and item 4 did not result in an improved final solution. In order
198 to maintain the questionnaire's integrity, cross-loading items were retained and item 4 was
199 rationally assigned to the Factor 2.

200 -----
201 Approximate position for Table 2
202 -----

203 In sum, the three factors extracted using data from the French-Canadian MPAI-4 in a
204 Canadian TBI sample were similar, but not entirely identical to the three subscales found in the
205 original MPAI-4. This may be explained, for example, by sociocultural differences between
206 American and French-Canadian samples, which can affect the distribution of items between
207 factors. However, the factor labels proposed by Malec⁶ also suited the extracted factors and were
208 thus retained. Factor 1, labelled "Participation", includes 11 items for mobility, motor control,
209 initiative, social contact, independent living, employment status and financial management and
210 accounted for 31.45% of the total variance. Factor 2 labelled "Ability" consists of 10 items,
211 relates to hearing and cognitive abilities, communication and interpersonal interactions and
212 accounted for 10.36% of the total variance. The Factor 3 labelled "Adjustment" accounted for
213 6.86% of the total variance and consists of 8 items assessing eye vision, symptoms and mood,
214 such as dizziness, anxiety or depression, pain, headaches and fatigue.

215

216 **Internal Consistency Reliability Analysis**

217 Values of Cronbach's alpha for the French-Canadian MPAI-4's three subscales are
218 presented in Table 2. According to Kline's⁴⁰ guidelines, the subscales showed good internal
219 consistency, all Cronbach's alpha values $.70 \leq \alpha \leq .89$. No significant increase in alpha for any
220 of the subscales could have been achieved by eliminating individual items.

221 **Reference Norms**

222 T score conversion is recommended for clinical use of the MPAI-4, to compare subscale
223 scores and identify areas needing intervention.⁴¹ Using data from participants included in the
224 validation analyses ($N = 1012$), French-Canadian reference norms for TBI were computed by
225 converting raw scores into T scores. Notably, subscales scores were computed using the original
226 MPAI-4 subscale composition to allow comparison between studies using different versions of
227 the MPAI-4. Conversion tables for the MPAI-4 total and subscales scores can be found online in
228 the Supplementary material (tables S1a to S1d). Tables presenting raw MPAI-4 means and SD
229 according to sex, age, TBI severity, and rehabilitation setting are also included in the
230 Supplementary materials (tables S2a to S2d).

231 **Discussion**

232 The aim of this paper was to validate the factor structure and establish internal
233 consistency reliability of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 in a Canadian sample of TBI adults
234 receiving post-acute rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting. We also aimed to
235 provide a set of reference norms to guide clinical use of the MPAI-4. The resulting French-
236 Canadian MPAI-4 was implemented in the clinical practice of four rehabilitation centres in the
237 Greater Montreal region, thus generating MPAI-4 data for all TBI patients receiving post-acute
238 rehabilitation services in those centres. The internal consistency of each subscales in the French-

239 Canadian MPAI-4 was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and our findings show good internal
240 consistency, with alpha values similar to those reported for the original MPAI-4.⁴¹ To validate
241 the factor structure of the French-Canadian MPAI-4, we collected all patients' first MPAI-4
242 measure and conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). To our knowledge, this study is the
243 first to try and replicate the original MPAI-4 factor structure using another version of the MPAI-
244 4 questionnaire. Our results also show that the factor structure of the French-Canadian MPAI-4
245 is similar to the original MPAI-4's, that is, the questionnaire's items distribute themselves
246 between three factors (i.e. three subscales). However, some discrepancies were found at the item
247 distribution level between the French-Canadian and the original MPAI-4.

248 First, one item (item 4, audition) did not load on any subscale. To preserve the
249 questionnaire's integrity, we decided to retain the item 4 and rationally assign it to the Factor 2
250 "Ability", as it was attributed to that subscale in the original MPAI-4. We found important and
251 clinical utility in keeping the item 4, as hearing impairment is not reflected in any other item in
252 the questionnaire. Retention of this item also ensures that we maintain the questionnaire's power
253 of generalization and do not compromise comparison purpose with other studies using different
254 versions of the MPAI-4. Secondly, the composition of the subscales slightly differs between the
255 French-Canadian and the original MPAI-4. The EFA attributed a few items to different subscales
256 when compared to the original MPAI-4. For instance, our results suggest that the items 1
257 (mobility) and 2 (use of hands) belonged to the Participation subscale, rather than the Ability
258 subscale as in the original MPAI-4.

259 The small differences in item distribution between subscales can be explained by a few
260 factors, such as sample-specific clinical characteristics and inherent sociocultural differences
261 between American and French-Canadian samples, but also the choice of statistical analysis used

262 to measure construct validity. It is well supported in the literature that different factor structures
263 can be obtained following administration to a second sample due to a combination of sampling
264 variations, sociocultural/linguistic context and applied methodology (for example, see Chen et
265 al.⁴² or Gaskin et al.⁴³). Besides those subtle variations in item distribution and in line with Kean
266 et al.'s¹⁶ conclusions, our results nevertheless show general support for the MPAI-4's subscale
267 structure developed in previous psychometric studies: the French-Canadian MPAI-4 displays
268 three subscales that represent domains broadly defined as Ability, Adjustment and Participation.
269 Finally, given our EFA results, modifications to the tool (i.e. rearranging item order) so
270 subscales' score calculation reflected the French-Canadian factor structure was considered.
271 However, such a major change to the questionnaire would rather be detrimental, as comparison
272 purpose with other studies using different versions of the MPAI-4 would no longer be possible.

273 Lastly, the translation and validation of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 was of primary
274 importance, given the critical lack of available assessment tools for TBI sequelae in French for
275 use in French-Canadian rehabilitation settings. The access to not only a standardized tool, but
276 one that has been translated and validated in the primary language of the setting, allows
277 measuring more accurately TBI patients' impairments, progress and outcomes. The need to
278 validate the MPAI-4 in a French-Canadian sub-population is also in line with recommendations
279 made by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention⁴⁴ regarding the importance of conducting
280 validation studies of outcome measures among sub-populations in order to expand scientific
281 knowledge of outcomes and establish best practices. Moreover, INESSS-ONF Clinical Practice
282 Guidelines in TBI rehabilitation²¹ also prescribe standardized evaluations²¹ of patients' condition
283 using validated assessment tools in order to orient interventions. The use of the validated French-
284 Canadian MPAI-4 with its specific reference norms will indeed allow professionals to apply best

285 practices, but also guide the use of a common measure between rehabilitation centres, which in
286 turn facilitates clinical discussions and comparisons as well as generates new knowledge
287 regarding TBI outcomes. Overall, the French-Canadian MPAI-4 presents to be a validated TBI
288 assessment tool for use in a French-Canadian post-acute rehabilitation setting. The translation of
289 such a comprehensive and established clinical tool certainly fills a gap in the field of TBI
290 rehabilitation and also adds to the assessment options available for use by French-speaking
291 rehabilitation professionals, individuals with TBI and their significant others.

292 **Study Limitations**

293 One limitation of this study is the lack of direct comparison of factor structure measures
294 between the original and French-Canadian versions of the MPAI-4. Rasch analyses were used for
295 the development of the original MPAI-4 questionnaire and its factor structure.⁴¹ In our case,
296 however, it was best to deploy EFA, as our aim was to reveal item distribution and factor
297 structure of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 without a priori manipulations.^{45,46} Consequently, the
298 statistical methodology used does not allow direct comparison and may also lead to a different
299 final solution with slightly different item distribution between factors.

300 **Conclusions**

301 Using an exploratory factor analysis on data from the French-Canadian version of the
302 MPAI-4 and a Canadian sample of TBI adults receiving rehabilitation services, three factors
303 were extracted and are similar to the three subscales found in the original MPAI-4. Small
304 differences in item distribution across factors can be explained in part by sociocultural and
305 clinical differences between the Canadian and American samples used to establish the factor
306 structure of the questionnaire. The factor labels suggested by Malec⁶ also suited the extracted
307 factors and were thus retained for the French-Canadian MPAI-4 (i.e. Ability, Adjustment,

308 Participation). In sum, the French-Canadian MPAI-4 factor structure is validated, and the
309 questionnaire shows good internal consistency. The French-Canadian MPAI-4, with its reference
310 norms, represents a suitable tool to measure functional evolution, outcomes and social
311 integration of individuals with TBI receiving rehabilitation services in a French-Canadian
312 context.

References

313

314 1. Azouvi, P., Arnould, A., Dromer, E., & Vallat-Azouvi, C. (2017). Neuropsychology of
315 traumatic brain injury: An expert overview. *Revue Neurologique*, *173*(7-8), 461–472.

316 doi:10.1016/j.neurol.2017.07.006

317 2. Bennett, S., & Bennett, J. W. (2000). The process of evidence-based practice in

318 occupational therapy: Informing clinical decisions. *Australian Occupational Therapy*

319 *Journal*, *47*(4), 171–180. doi:10.1046/j.1440-1630.2000.00237.x.

320 3. Stiers, W., Carlozzi, N., Cernich, A., Velozo, C., Pape, T., Hart, T., ... Whiteneck, G.

321 (2012). Measurement of social participation outcomes in rehabilitation of veterans with
322 traumatic brain injury. *The Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development*, *49*(1),

323 139-154. doi:10.1682/jrrd.2010.07.0131

324 4. Cattelani, R., Corsini, D., Posteraro, L., Agosti, M., & Saccavini, M. (2009). The Italian

325 version of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4. A new measure of brain injury
326 outcome. *European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, *45*(4), 513–519.

327 5. Chung, P., Yun, S., & Khan, F. (2014). A comparison of participation outcome measures
328 and the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health Core Sets for

329 traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, *46*(2), 108–116.

330 doi:10.2340/16501977-1257

331 6. Malec, J. F. (2005). The Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory [Questionnaire]. The

332 Center for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. Retrieved from

333 <http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai>

334 7. Lezak, M. D. (1987). Relationships between personality disorders, social disturbances,

335 and physical disability following traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Head Trauma*

- 336 *Rehabilitation*, 2(1), 57–69. doi:10.1097/00001199-198703000-00009
- 337 8. Malec, J. F., & Thompson, J. M. (1994). Relationship of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability
338 Inventory to functional outcome and cognitive performance measures. *Journal of Head
339 Trauma Rehabilitation*, 9(4), 1–15. doi:10.1097/00001199-199412000-00003
- 340 9. Malec, J. F., Kragness, M., Evans, R. W., Finlay, K. L., Kent, A., & Lezak, M. D. (2003).
341 Further psychometric evaluation and revision of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability
342 Inventory in a national sample. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 18(6), 479–492.
343 doi:10.1097/00001199-200311000-00002.
- 344 10. Ashley, J. G., Ashley, M. J., Masel, B. E., Randle, K., Kreber, L. A., Singh, C., ...
345 Griesbach, G. S. (2018). The influence of post-acute rehabilitation length of stay on
346 traumatic brain injury outcome: a retrospective exploratory study. *Brain Injury*, 32(5),
347 600–607. doi:10.1080/02699052.2018.1432896
- 348 11. Curran, C., Dorstyn, D., Polychronis, C., & Denson, L. (2014). Functional outcomes of
349 community-based brain injury rehabilitation clients. *Brain Injury*, 29(1), 25–32.
350 doi:10.3109/02699052.2014.948067
- 351 12. Dharm-Datta, S., Gough, M. R. C., Porter, P. J., Duncan-Anderson, J., Olivier, E.,
352 McGilloway, E., & Etherington, J. (2015). Successful outcomes following
353 neurorehabilitation in military traumatic brain injury patients in the United Kingdom.
354 *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 79, S197–S203.
355 doi:10.1097/ta.0000000000000721
- 356 13. Hux, K. (2019). Post-acute rehabilitation effects on functional outcome and discharge
357 disposition of people with severe traumatic brain injury. *Brain injury*, 33(10), 1332–1340.
358 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699052.2019.1641745>

- 359 14. Scott, K. L., Strong, C.-A. H., Gorter, B., & Donders, J. (2016). Predictors of post-
360 concussion rehabilitation outcomes at three-month follow-up. *The Clinical*
361 *Neuropsychologist*, *30(1)*, 66–81. doi:10.1080/13854046.2015.1127427
- 362 15. Jackson, D., Seaman, K., Sharp, K., Singer, R., Wagland, J., & Turner-Stokes, L. (2017).
363 Staged residential post-acute rehabilitation for adults following acquired brain injury: A
364 comparison of functional gains rated on the UK Functional Assessment Measure (UK
365 FIM+FAM) and the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI-4). *Brain injury*,
366 *31(11)*, 1405–1413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699052.2017.1350998>
- 367 16. Kean, J., Malec, J. F., Altman, I. M., & Swick, S. (2011). Rasch measurement analysis of
368 the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI-4) in a community-based rehabilitation
369 sample. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, *28(5)*, 745–753. <https://doi.org/10.1089/neu.2010.1573>
- 370 17. Lewis, F. D., Horn, G. J., & Russell, R. (2017). Examination of post-hospital residential
371 brain injury rehabilitation outcomes across the age spectrum. *International Journal of*
372 *Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, *5(1)*, 1-6. doi:10.4172/2329-9096.1000390
- 373 18. Malec, J. F. (2004). Comparability of Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory ratings by
374 staff, significant others and people with acquired brain injury. *Brain Injury*, *18(6)*, 563–
375 575. doi:10.1080/02699050310001646134
- 376 19. McCauley, S. R., Wilde, E. A., Anderson, V. A., Bedell, G., Beers, S. R., Campbell, T. F.,
377 ... Yeates, K. O. (2012). Recommendations for the use of common outcome measures in
378 pediatric traumatic brain injury research. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, *29(4)*, 678–705.
379 doi:10.1089/neu.2011.1838
- 380 20. Wilde, E. A., Whiteneck, G. G., Bogner, J., Bushnik, T., Cifu, D. X., Dikmen, S., ... von
381 Steinbuechel, N. (2010). Recommendations for the use of common outcome measures in

- 382 traumatic brain injury research. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, *91(11)*,
383 1650–1660.e17. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2010.06.033
- 384 21. Bayley, M., Swaine, B., Lamontagne, M.-E., Marshall, S., Allaire, A.-S., Kua, A., et al.
385 (2016). *INESSS-ONF clinical practice guideline for the rehabilitation of adults with*
386 *moderate to severe traumatic brain injury*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Neurotrauma
387 Foundation.
- 388 22. Malec, J. F., Moessner, A. M., Kragness, M., & Lezak, M. D. (2000). Refining a measure
389 of brain injury sequelae to predict postacute rehabilitation outcome: Rating scale analysis
390 of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory. *The Journal of Head Trauma*
391 *Rehabilitation*, *15(1)*, 670–682. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001199-200002000-00006>
- 392 23. Bohac, D., Malec, J., & Moessner, A. (1997). Factor analysis of the Mayo-Portland
393 Adaptability Inventory: Structure and validity. *Brain Injury*, *11(7)*, 469–482.
394 doi:10.1080/713802185
- 395 24. Altman, I. M., Swick, S., Parrot, D., & Malec, J. F. (2010). Effectiveness of community-
396 based rehabilitation after traumatic brain injury for 489 program completers compared
397 with those precipitously discharged. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*,
398 *91(11)*, 1697–1704. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2010.08.001
- 399 25. Altman, I. M., Swick, S., & Malec, J. F. (2013). Effectiveness of home- and community-
400 based rehabilitation in a large cohort of patients disabled by cerebrovascular accident:
401 Evidence of a dose-response relationship. *Archives of Physical Medicine and*
402 *Rehabilitation*, *94(9)*, 1837–1841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2013.02.014>
- 403 26. Eicher, V., Murphy, M. P., Murphy, T. F., & Malec, J. F. (2012). Progress assessed with
404 the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory in 604 participants in 4 types of post-inpatient

- 405 rehabilitation brain injury programs. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*,
406 93(1), 100–107. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2011.06.038
- 407 27. Malec, J. F. (2001). Impact of comprehensive day treatment on societal participation for
408 persons with acquired brain injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*,
409 82(7), 885–895. doi:10.1053/apmr.2001.23895.
- 410 28. Malec, J. F., & Kean, J. (2016). Post-inpatient brain injury rehabilitation outcomes: Report
411 from the National Outcome Info Database. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, 33(14), 1371–1379.
412 doi:10.1089/neu.2015.4080
- 413 29. Ford, C. E. L., Malley, D., Bateman, A., Clare, I. C. H., Wagner, A. P., & Gracey, F.
414 (2016). Selection and visualisation of outcome measures for complex post-acute acquired
415 brain injury rehabilitation interventions. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 39(1), 65–79.
416 doi:10.3233/nre-161339
- 417 30. Malec, J. F., Kean, J., Altman, I. M., & Swick, S. (2012). Mayo-Portland Adaptability
418 Inventory: Comparing psychometrics in cerebrovascular accident to traumatic brain
419 injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 93(12), 2271–2275.
420 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2012.06.013
- 421 31. Hamed, R., Tariah, H. A., Malkawi, S., & Holm, M. B. (2012). The Arabic version of the
422 Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory 4. *International Journal of Rehabilitation*
423 *Research*, 35(3), 243–247. doi:10.1097/mrr.0b013e3283544c9f
- 424 32. The Center for Outcome Measurement In Brain Injury. (2020). *Introduction to the Mayo-*
425 *Portland Adaptability Inventory*. Retrieved from <http://www.tbims.org/mpai/>
- 426 33. McKerral, M., Léveillé, G., Goulet, P., Vincent, P., & Laliberté, S. (2014). MPAI-4
427 Version canadienne-française [Questionnaire]. The Center for Outcome Measurement in

- 428 Brain Injury. Retrieved from <http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai>
- 429 34. McKerral, M., Léveillé, G., Goulet, P., & Vincent, P. (2014). *Manuel MPAI-4 Version*
430 *canadienne-française*. The Center for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. Retrieved
431 from <http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai>
- 432 35. Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis.
433 *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20(1)*, 141–151.
434 doi:10.1177/001316446002000116
- 435 36. Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Los Angeles:
436 SAGE Publications.
- 437 37. Pituch, K. A., & Stevens, J. P. (2015). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social*
438 *sciences* (6th ed.). London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- 439 38. Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.).
440 London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- 441 39. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston:
442 Pearson.
- 443 40. Kline, P. (2000). *The handbook of psychological testing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- 444 41. Malec, J. F., & Lezak, M. (2008). *Manual for the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory*
445 *(MPAI-4) for adults, children and adolescents*. The Center for Outcome Measurement in
446 Brain Injury. Retrieved from <http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai>
- 447 42. Chen, P.-Y., Yang, C.-M., & Morin, C. M. (2015). Validating the cross-cultural factor
448 structure and invariance property of the Insomnia Severity Index: Evidence based on
449 ordinal EFA and CFA. *Sleep Medicine, 16(5)*, 598–603. doi:10.1016/j.sleep.2014.11.016
- 450 43. Gaskin, C. J., Lambert, S. D., Bowe, S. J., & Orellana, L. (2017). Why sample selection

- 451 matters in exploratory factor analysis: Implications for the 12-item World Health
452 Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*,
453 *17(1)*, 1-9. doi:10.1186/s12874-017-0309-5
- 454 44. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and
455 Prevention. (2015). *Report to congress on traumatic brain injury in the United States: Epidemiology and rehabilitation*. Retrieved from
456 [https://www.cdc.gov/traumaticbraininjury/pdf/tbi_report_to_congress_epi_and_rehab-](https://www.cdc.gov/traumaticbraininjury/pdf/tbi_report_to_congress_epi_and_rehab-a.pdf)
457 [a.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/traumaticbraininjury/pdf/tbi_report_to_congress_epi_and_rehab-a.pdf)
- 458
- 459 45. Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.).
460 London: Guilford Press.
- 461 46. Sousa, V. D., & Rojjanasrirat, W. (2011). Translation, adaptation and validation of
462 instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: A clear and user-
463 friendly guideline. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, *17(2)*, 268–274.
464 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01434.x>
- 465
- 466

467


Figure Legend

468

Figure 1. Scree plot obtained by performing an exploratory factor analysis using varimax

469

rotation on z-scores from the 30 items of the French-Canadian MPAI-4.



490
 491 *Figure 1.* Scree plot obtained by performing an exploratory factor analysis using varimax
 492 rotation on z-scores from the 30 items of the French-Canadian MPAI-4.
 493

494 Table 1

495

496 *Patients' sociodemographic and clinical characteristics*

497

	Total $N = 1012$ (%)
Mean age (in years) at TBI ($N = 1012$)	55.83 ± 21.07
Sex	
Male	625 (61.80)
Female	386 (38.10)
Missing	1 (0.10)
TBI severity	
Mild	229 (22.60)
Complicated mild	229 (22.60)
Moderate	371 (36.70)
Severe	183 (18.10)
Education level	
University	284 (28.10)
College	221 (21.80)
High school	223 (22.00)
Elementary	216 (21.30)
None	38 (3.80)
Missing	30 (3.00)
Mean time (in months) between TBI and MPAI-4 measure ($N = 1011$)	4.93 ± 14.16

498

499

500 Table 2

501
502 *Summary of exploratory factor analysis results for the French-Canadian MPAI-4 questionnaire*
503 *(N = 1012)*

504

Item	Communality	Varimax rotated factor loadings		
		F_1	F_2	F_3
1. Mobility	0.61	0.79		
2. Use of hands	0.43	0.58		
3. Vision	0.19			0.20
4. Audition	0.12			
5. Dizziness	0.22			0.40
6. Motor speech	0.31	0.34	0.26	
7a. Verbal communication	0.59	0.37	0.61	
7b. Nonverbal communication	0.59	0.32	0.67	
8. Attention/concentration	0.54	0.21	0.63	0.29
9. Memory	0.64	0.37	0.70	
10. Fund of information	0.50	0.32	0.60	
11. Novel problem-solving	0.73	0.46	0.73	
12. Visuospatial abilities	0.59	0.51	0.54	
13. Anxiety	0.46			0.68
14. Depression	0.41			0.65
15. Irritability, anger, aggression	0.39		0.39	0.36
16. Pain and headaches	0.33		-0.21	0.54
17. Fatigue	0.40	0.41		0.44
18. Sensitivity to mild symptoms	0.44			0.68
19. Inappropriate social interaction	0.44		0.49	
20. Impaired self-awareness	0.66	0.37	0.70	
21. Family/significant relationships	0.20		0.27	0.27
22. Initiation	0.54	0.48	0.42	0.20
23. Social contact	0.39	0.46	0.29	
24. Leisure/recreational activities	0.46	0.56		
25. Self-care	0.72	0.78	0.35	
26. Residence	0.65	0.78	0.23	
27. Transportation	0.65	0.73	0.25	
28. Work/school	0.18	0.29	0.22	
29. Money management	0.69	0.61	0.56	
Eigenvalues		9.44	3.11	2.06
Percent of variance (%)		31.45	10.36	6.86
Cronbach's alpha (α)		.89	.89	.70

505

506 *Note.* Factor loading values < .20 are not shown. Highest factor loading values are in bold. F_1
507 represents the subscale Participation; F_2 represents the subscale Ability; F_3 represents the
508 subscale Adjustment.

509

510 **Supplementary materials: French-Canadian TBI reference norms and raw scores**

511

512 Table S1a

513

514 *Conversion of MPAI-4 Total raw scores to T scores (mean = 50; SD = 10) for Canadian TBI*
515 *adults receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N =1012)*

516

Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score
0	N/A	28	42.05	56	58.39	84	N/A
1	N/A	29	42.63	57	58.98	85	75.32
2	N/A	30	43.22	58	59.56	86	N/A
3	27.46	31	43.80	59	60.15	87	N/A
4	N/A	32	44.38	60	60.73	88	N/A
5	28.62	33	44.97	61	61.31	89	77.66
6	29.21	34	45.55	62	61.90	90	N/A
7	29.79	35	46.14	63	62.48	91	78.82
8	30.38	36	46.72	64	63.06	92	N/A
9	30.96	37	47.30	65	63.65	93	N/A
10	31.54	38	47.89	66	64.23	94	N/A
11	32.13	39	48.47	67	64.82	95	N/A
12	32.71	40	49.05	68	65.40	96	N/A
13	33.29	41	49.64	69	65.98	97	N/A
14	33.88	42	50.22	70	66.57	98	N/A
15	34.46	43	50.81	71	67.15	99	N/A
16	35.05	44	51.39	72	67.73	100	N/A
17	35.63	45	51.97	73	68.32	101	N/A
18	36.21	46	52.56	74	68.90	102	N/A
19	36.80	47	53.14	75	69.48	103	N/A
20	37.38	48	53.72	76	70.07	104	N/A
21	37.96	49	54.31	77	70.65	105	N/A
22	38.55	50	54.89	78	71.24	106	N/A
23	39.13	51	55.48	79	71.82	107	N/A
24	39.71	52	56.06	80	72.40	108	N/A
25	40.30	53	56.64	81	72.99	109	N/A
26	40.88	54	57.23	82	N/A	110	N/A
27	41.47	55	57.81	83	74.15	111	N/A

517

518 *Note.* N/A T score = Raw score not obtained within the sample. According to Malec and Lezak⁴¹:

519 T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average or typical of people involved in

520 outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T scores between 40 and 50 may

521 be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity compared to other people with

522 ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the moderate to severe range compared

523 to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would suggest severe limitations even as

524 compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and 40 suggest mild limitations, and T

525 scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

526

527 Table S1b

528

529 *Conversion of MPAI-4 Ability subscale raw scores to T scores (mean = 50; SD = 10) for*
530 *Canadian TBI adults receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N =1012)*

531

Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score
0	32.34	16	53.26	32	74.19
1	33.65	17	54.57	33	75.49
2	34.96	18	55.88	34	76.80
3	36.26	19	57.19	35	78.11
4	37.57	20	58.49	36	79.42
5	38.88	21	59.80	37	N/A
6	40.19	22	61.11	38	82.03
7	41.50	23	62.42	39	83.34
8	42.80	24	63.73	40	N/A
9	44.11	25	65.03	41	N/A
10	45.42	26	66.34	42	N/A
11	46.73	27	67.65	43	N/A
12	48.03	28	68.96	44	N/A
13	49.34	29	70.26	45	N/A
14	50.65	30	71.57	46	N/A
15	51.96	31	72.88	47	N/A

532

533 *Note.* N/A T score = Raw score not obtained within the sample. According to Malec and Lezak⁴¹:

534 T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average or typical of people involved in

535 outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T scores between 40 and 50 may

536 be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity compared to other people with

537 ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the moderate to severe range compared

538 to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would suggest severe limitations even as

539 compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and 40 suggest mild limitations, and T

540 scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

541

542 Table S1c

543

544 *Conversion of MPAI-4 Adjustment subscale raw scores to T scores (mean = 50; SD = 10) for*
545 *Canadian TBI adults receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N =1012)*

546

Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score
0	23.01	16	46.73	32	70.46
1	24.50	17	48.22	33	71.94
2	25.98	18	49.70	34	73.42
3	27.46	19	51.18	35	74.90
4	28.94	20	52.67	36	76.39
5	30.43	21	54.15	37	77.87
6	31.91	22	55.63	38	79.35
7	33.39	23	57.11	39	N/A
8	34.87	24	58.60	40	N/A
9	36.36	25	60.08	41	N/A
10	37.84	26	61.56	42	N/A
11	39.32	27	63.04	43	N/A
12	40.80	28	64.53	44	N/A
13	42.29	29	66.01	45	N/A
14	43.77	30	67.49	46	N/A
15	45.25	31	68.97		

547

548 *Note.* N/A T score = Raw score not obtained within the sample. According to Malec and Lezak⁴¹:

549 T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average or typical of people involved in

550 outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T scores between 40 and 50 may

551 be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity compared to other people with

552 ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the moderate to severe range compared

553 to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would suggest severe limitations even as

554 compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and 40 suggest mild limitations, and T

555 scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

556

557 Table S1d

558

559 *Conversion of MPAI-4 Participation subscale raw scores to T scores (mean = 50; SD = 10) for*
560 *Canadian TBI adults receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N =1012)*

561

Raw score	T score	Raw score	T score
0	27.78	16	49.07
1	29.12	17	50.40
2	30.45	18	51.74
3	31.78	19	53.07
4	33.11	20	54.40
5	34.44	21	55.73
6	35.77	22	57.06
7	37.10	23	58.39
8	38.43	24	59.72
9	39.76	25	61.05
10	41.09	26	62.38
11	42.42	27	63.71
12	43.75	28	65.04
13	45.08	29	66.37
14	46.41	30	67.70
15	47.74		

562

563 *Note.* According to Malec and Lezak⁴¹: T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average
564 or typical of people involved in outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T
565 scores between 40 and 50 may be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity
566 compared to other people with ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the
567 moderate to severe range compared to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would
568 suggest severe limitations even as compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and
569 40 suggest mild limitations, and T scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

570

571 Table S2a

572

573 *Descriptive raw data for the MPAI-4 according to sex, for a sample of Canadian TBI adults*
574 *receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N =1011)*

575

	Mean (SD)
Male (N = 625)	
Ability subscale	13.99 (7.78)
Adjustment subscale	17.91 (6.88)
Participation subscale	17.03 (7.41)
MPAI-4 total score	42.11 (17.39)
Female (N = 386)	
Ability subscale	12.66 (7.32)
Adjustment subscale	18.62 (6.49)
Participation subscale	16.13 (7.62)
MPAI-4 total score	40.72 (16.67)

576

577 Table S2b

578

579 *Descriptive raw data for the MPAI-4 according to age, for a sample of Canadian TBI adults*
580 *receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N = 1012)*

581

	Mean (SD)
Ages 14-19 years (N = 30)	
Ability subscale	11.47 (7.44)
Adjustment subscale	17.37 (7.05)
Participation subscale	14.47 (7.30)
MPAI-4 total score	36.83 (16.93)
Ages 20-29 years (N = 127)	
Ability subscale	12.48 (8.62)
Adjustment subscale	18.46 (6.73)
Participation subscale	15.23 (7.80)
MPAI-4 total score	39.53 (18.30)
Ages 30-39 years (N = 117)	
Ability subscale	10.74 (6.97)
Adjustment subscale	18.20 (7.23)
Participation subscale	13.66 (6.85)
MPAI-4 total score	36.91 (16.04)
Ages 40-49 years (N = 111)	
Ability subscale	12.30 (7.38)
Adjustment subscale	19.41 (6.43)
Participation subscale	15.04 (6.81)
MPAI-4 total score	40.15 (15.76)
Ages 50-59 years (N = 159)	
Ability subscale	12.67 (7.49)
Adjustment subscale	18.08 (6.12)
Participation subscale	14.85 (7.14)
MPAI-4 total score	39.34 (16.50)
Ages 60-69 years (N = 146)	
Ability subscale	13.57 (7.00)
Adjustment subscale	17.63 (6.87)
Participation subscale	16.48 (7.30)
MPAI-4 total score	40.83 (16.90)
Ages 70-79 years (N = 168)	
Ability subscale	15.36 (7.50)
Adjustment subscale	17.94 (7.46)
Participation subscale	19.27 (7.26)
MPAI-4 total score	45.25 (18.02)
Ages 80 years and above (N = 154)	
Ability subscale	16.37 (7.01)
Adjustment subscale	18.21 (6.24)
Participation subscale	21.09 (6.29)
MPAI-4 total score	48.05 (15.39)

582 Table S2c

583

584 *Descriptive raw data for the MPAI-4 according to TBI severity, for a sample of Canadian TBI*
585 *adults receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N =1012)*

586

	Mean (SD)
Mild (N = 229)	
Ability subscale	8.68 (4.88)
Adjustment subscale	18.11 (6.26)
Participation subscale	10.61 (5.09)
MPAI-4 total score	32.04 (12.18)
Complicated Mild (N = 229)	
Ability subscale	14.38 (7.67)
Adjustment subscale	17.68 (6.93)
Participation subscale	18.68 (7.34)
MPAI-4 total score	43.55 (17.36)
Moderate (N = 371)	
Ability subscale	13.45 (6.94)
Adjustment subscale	17.36 (6.50)
Participation subscale	17.45 (6.86)
MPAI-4 total score	41.35 (16.07)
Severe (N = 183)	
Ability subscale	18.48 (8.16)
Adjustment subscale	20.65 (7.08)
Participation subscale	20.40 (7.10)
MPAI-4 total score	51.96 (17.73)

587

588 Table S2d

589

590 *Descriptive raw data for the MPAI-4 according to rehabilitation setting, for a sample of*
591 *Canadian TBI adults receiving rehabilitation services in a French-speaking setting (N =1012)*

592

	Mean (SD)
Inpatient Rehabilitation (N = 636)	
Ability subscale	16.19 (7.32)
Adjustment subscale	19.09 (6.50)
Participation subscale	20.29 (6.02)
MPAI-4 total score	48.01 (15.75)
Outpatient Rehabilitation (N = 376)	
Ability subscale	8.94 (5.73)
Adjustment subscale	16.69 (6.89)
Participation subscale	10.66 (5.61)
MPAI-4 total score	31.06 (13.73)

593

Author Guidelines for Reporting Scale Development and Validation Results
(Cabrera-Nguyen, 2010)

Manuscript Guidelines	
Precisely define the target construct.	✓ As much as possible, given the maximum word limit.
Justify the need for your new measure. For example, if measures of the construct exist in the literature, explain the value added by your new scale. How might the new measure enhance the substantive knowledge base or social work practice?	✓ See Introduction and Discussion sections.
Indicate that you have submitted your initial pool of items to expert review (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Report (a) the number of items in the preliminary pool; (b) the number of expert reviewers and their qualifications; and (c) any major changes to your initial item pool following the review (e.g., a substantial decrease in the number of items, changes to the original item response format, overhaul of item pool due to experts' assessment regarding content validity).	✓ See Methods section. No changes in pool of items (number, response format, etc.). Only translation and adaptation to cultural context, as mentioned in manuscript.
Report the name and version of the statistical software package used for all analyses.	✓ See Methods section.
Identify and justify the sampling strategy (e.g., convenience, snowball) and sampling frame. Report standard sample demographic characteristics as well as other salient sample characteristics (e.g., "participants were advanced- standing MSW students at a large public Midwestern university concentrating in social service administration").	✓ See Methods section.
Discuss relevant data preparation and screening procedures. For instance, do the data meet the appropriate assumptions for factor analysis? If not, what actions were taken? Report tests of factorability if appropriate (e.g., report Bartlett's test of sphericity).	✓ See Results section.
Provide all dates of data collection.	✓ See Methods section.
Avoid use of principal components analysis (PCA) as a precursor to CFA (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Instead, start with EFA to assess the underlying factor structure and refine the item pool. EFA should be followed by CFA using a different sample (or samples) to evaluate the EFA-informed a priori theory about the measure's factor-structure and psychometric properties. (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Henson & Roberts, 2006; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). For CFA, authors should specify an a priori hypothesized model and a priori competing models (Jackson, Gillaspay, & Purc-Stephenson, 2009).	✓ An EFA was conducted, as we wanted to reveal the factor structure of the French-Canadian MPAI without a priori assumptions. Following recommendations from Kline (2016), the EFA was not followed up with a CFA.
Describe the matrix (or matrices) you analyzed (e.g., covariance, correlation). Include matrices in the manuscript if feasible; otherwise, indicate these data are available upon request.	✓ See Methods section.

<p>Report the amount of missing data and describe how missing data were handled. For a review of practices for handling missing data, see Sterne and colleagues (2009), Rose and Fraser (2008), and Horton and Kleinman (2007). Provide a rationale for your approach to handling missing data. Authors are encouraged to consider using multiple imputation or model estimation with full-information maximum likelihood (FIML; Rose & Fraser, 2008).</p>	<p>✓ No missing data, as mentioned in the Results section.</p>
<p>Compare your CFA model with the alternative or competing models. Do competing models fit the data better or worse than your model (e.g., does your four-factor model of acculturation fit the data better than a two-factor model or a one-factor model)? Identify the preferable model based on appropriate fit statistics (e.g., chi-square difference test for nested models, Akaike information criterion for non-nested models), parsimony, and relevant theory.</p>	<p>N/A (no CFA was conducted).</p>
<p>Include your scale (items and response options) in an appendix.</p>	<p>French-Canadian version of the MPAAI-4 can be found on the COMBI website, as mentioned in the Introduction.</p>
<p>Report how methodological limitations may have impacted findings regarding your measure's psychometric properties (e.g., note potential repercussions of suboptimal sampling techniques, discuss implications of using listwise deletion to handle missing data instead of multiple imputation or FIML).</p>	<p>✓ See Discussion section.</p>
<p>Discuss directions for future research (e.g., if appropriate, testing your scale for measurement invariance by conducting CFA on different populations).</p>	<p>✓ See Discussion section.</p>
Reporting Guidelines for Exploratory Factor Analysis	
<p>How large a sample? One common rule of thumb is to ensure a person-to-item ratio of 10:1. Another rule of thumb is that $N = 300$ is usually acceptable (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). However, some researchers have criticized these sample size rules of thumb, noting the appropriate sample size is dependent on the features of the gathered data. These researchers recommend obtaining the largest possible sample because the adequacy of the sample size cannot be determined until after the data have been analyzed (Henson & Roberts, 2006).</p>	<p>✓ Sample size ($N = 1012$) is appropriate for EFA of the French-Canadian MPAAI-4 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).</p>
<p>Run EFA . . . or not. Run a preliminary EFA to determine if further data collection is required based on the following criteria: (a) If communalities are greater than .50 or there are 10:1 items per factor with factor loadings of roughly $.4$, then a sample size of 150 to 200 is likely to be adequate; (b) If communalities are all at least .60 or there are a minimum of 4:1 items per factor with factor loadings above $.6$, then even smaller sample sizes may suffice; (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Report if additional data collection was necessary due to inadequate sample size. If so, report the new participants' sociodemographic characteristics and test for differences between groups using standard statistical procedures (e.g., t tests).</p>	<p>✓ Sample size ($N = 1012$) is appropriate for conducting an EFA. No additional data collection was necessary due to inadequate sample size.</p>

<p>Give EFA details. Report the specific rotation strategy used (e.g. varimax, geomin). Justify the decision to use an orthogonal or oblique solution. One recommendation is to always begin with an oblique rotation, empirically assess factor intercorrelations, and report them before deciding upon a final rotation solution (Henson & Roberts, 2006; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Some researchers argue oblique rotation is always the best approach because (a) factor intercorrelations are the norm in social sciences and (b) both approaches yield the same result if the factors happen to be uncorrelated (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Conversely, other researchers contend that orthogonal rotation is preferable because fewer parameters are estimated—orthogonal rotation is more parsimonious and amenable to replication (Henson & Roberts, 2006). Similarly, some researchers warn against relying on a statistical software package’s default settings to determine the appropriate type of oblique rotation (Henson & Roberts, 2006; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Others state that doing so is fine (Costello & Osborne, 2005, p.3). Given the lack of consensus, it is probably best to describe what you do and defend your approach on substantive grounds, if possible..</p>	<p>✓ See Results section.</p>
<p>Report the whole factor pattern/structure. Always report the whole factor pattern/structure matrix, including all of the items in the analysis. It is recommended that authors report this information in a chart following the example provided by Henson and Roberts (2006) on page 411.</p>	<p>✓ See Table 2.</p>
<p>Criteria for deleting (cross-loaded) items. Report any deleted items and the criteria used for deletion. Cross-loading items with values $\geq .32$ on at least two factors should generally be candidates for deletion, especially if there are other items with factor loadings of .50 or greater (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Rerun the EFA each time an item is deleted.</p>	<p>✓ See Results section. Cross-loading items were retained in order to maintain the questionnaire’s integrity.</p>
<p>Criteria for number of factors. Report the number of factors retained and justify this decision using multiple criteria (eigenvalue > 1, scree test, parallel analysis, rejection of a factor with fewer than 3 items, etc). Reporting the eigenvalue > 1 rule alone is inadequate because it is among the least accurate criteria for assessing factor retention (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Henson & Roberts, 2006).</p>	<p>✓ See Results section.</p>
<p>Explained variance. Report the variance explained by the factors.</p>	<p>✓ See Table 2.</p>
<p>In general, describe your decisions. EFA is a complex, iterative, and subjective process. Therefore, it is very important that researchers [and reviewers] be able to independently evaluate the results obtained in an EFA study. This can, and should, occur on two levels. Given the myriad subjective decisions necessary in EFA, independent researchers should be able to evaluate the analytic choices of authors in the reported study. Second, independent researchers should be able to accurately replicate the study on new data, or even employ a CFA (Hensen & Roberts, 2006, p. 400). Every decision should be thoroughly reported and justified. When in doubt, err on the side of over reporting.</p>	<p>✓ As much as possible, given the maximum word limit.</p>

References

- Cabrera-Nguyen, P. (2010). Author guideline for reporting scale development and validation results in the Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research, 1*, 99-103.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). London: Guilford Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.