medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Abstract

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

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

Setting: Inpatient and outpatient TBI rehabilitation programs.

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

Interventions: Not applicable.

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

One measurement tool commonly used by rehabilitation professionals working with TBI population is the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4 questionnaire (MPAI-4),[6] developed in the United States of America. Lezak[7] produced the initial Portland Adaptability Inventory (PAI), which was refined by Malec and Thompson[8] and renamed the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI). Over the years, the MPAI was further modified to maximize its internal consistency and reliability (for example, see Malec et al.[9]), resulting in its most recent version, the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory, 4th revision (MPAI-4).[6] The MPAI-4 questionnaire was broadly designed to assess functional abilities, global outcome and community integration by covering a wide range of physical, cognitive, emotional, behavioural and social problems that TBI patients may experience following their brain injury.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

The MPAI-4 questionnaire is now extensively used worldwide in inpatient, outpatient and vocational rehabilitation settings to measure TBI patients' progress and outcomes.[10–14] The multifaceted structure of the MPAI-4 makes it a useful tool for planning and assessing interventions, and studies have demonstrated the MPAI-4's clinical sensitivity to the effect of rehabilitation.[15–17] The MPAI-4 is best completed by consensus of the rehabilitation team, but can be completed by caregivers, significant others or by the patients themselves. For example, Malec[18] compared MPAI-4 scores between rehabilitation professionals, significant others and TBI patients, which revealed satisfactory internal consistency and interrater agreement. Finally, the MPAI-4 is among the recommended Common Data Elements Project for TBI adults, and an emerging measure for youth with TBI.[19,20] It is also a recommended participation measure in the INESSS-ONF Clinical Practice Guidelines following moderate and severe TBI.[21]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Overall, given its clinical usefulness, comprehensiveness and good psychometric properties, the MPAI-4 questionnaire was translated into other languages, notably French, Danish, Spanish, German, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish and Dutch. However, aside from the original MPAI-4, psychometric properties have only been established for the Italian[4] and Arabic[31] versions of the MPAI-4. Thus, the objective of this paper was to validate the factor structure and establish internal consistency reliability of the French-Canadian MPAI-4, using a Canadian sample of TBI adults receiving post-acute rehabilitation services in a French-speaking environment. A secondary aim was to provide a set of French-Canadian MPAI-4 reference norms for TBI to guide clinical use.

Methods

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Procedure and Participants

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

Approximate position for Table 1

Statistical Analysis

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

was used to assess the degree of inter-correlation between variables. Analyzed matrices (correlation, anti-image and reproduced correlations) are available upon request. Factors were selected if the eigenvalue was > 1 as suggested by Kaiser[35] and the number of factors was validated by inspection of the scree plot[36,37] with clinical consideration for coherence and interpretability of the factors. Appropriate for our sample size, conservative cutoffs of .20 on loading values were applied for statistical significance of an item[38] and items with loading values ≥ .40 were included in the interpretation of a factor.[36,37] The internal consistency of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 was determined using Cronbach's alpha. For all analyses, the level of significance was .05 using 95% confidence intervals. Finally, French-Canadian reference norms were developed for the MPAI-4 total score and subscales by converting raw scores into standardized T scores (Mean = 50; SD = 10). Means and SD were also computed on raw MPAI-4 data according to sex, age, TBI severity and rehabilitation setting. Analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh version 26.0 (2019).

Results

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

Before conducting the factor analysis on the full sample, participants were randomly divided into two groups. Exploratory factor analyses (EFA) with varimax rotation methods were performed separately on z-scores from both groups. The number of extracted factors, factor loadings for individual items as well as proportion of variance explained by each factor was similar between groups. The random samples were therefore combined and the EFA was performed on the whole sample. The EFA with varimax rotation method was performed on z-scores for the 30 items of the French-Canadian MPAI-4. The overall KMO was .93 and all KMO value for individual items were larger than or equal to .76, which is above the acceptable limit of .50.[36] Bartlett's test of sphericity, $\chi^2_{(435)} = 14188.20$, $p = .000$, indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large to conduct an EFA.[36] Five factors had eigenvalues superior to Kaiser's[35] criterion of 1, but the scree plot (see Figure 1) showed inflections that would justify retaining only three factors. Subsequent factor analyses on three-factor varimax and oblimin rotation solutions revealed little difference. Owing to parsimony, interpretability of factors and consistency with the factor structure of the original MPAI-4, a three-factor solution with a varimax rotation method was thus preferred.

Approximate position for Figure 1

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

193 values ≥ .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 ≥ .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 Malec[6] 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Internal Consistency Reliability Analysis

Values of Cronbach's alpha for the French-Canadian MPAI-4's three subscales are presented in Table 2. According to Kline's[40] guidelines, the subscales showed good internal consistency, all Cronbach's alpha values $.70 \leq \alpha \leq .89$. No significant increase in alpha for any of the subscales could have been achieved by eliminating individual items.

Reference Norms

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

Discussion

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Canadian MPAI-4 was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and our findings show good internal consistency, with alpha values similar to those reported for the original MPAI-4.[41] To validate the factor structure of the French-Canadian MPAI-4, we collected all patients' first MPAI-4 measure and conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). To our knowledge, this study is the first to try and replicate the original MPAI-4 factor structure using another version of the MPAI-4 questionnaire. Our results also show that the factor structure of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 is similar to the original MPAI-4's, that is, the questionnaire's items distribute themselves between three factors (i.e. three subscales). However, some discrepancies were found at the item distribution level between the French-Canadian and the original MPAI-4.

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

to measure construct validity. It is well supported in the literature that different factor structures can be obtained following administration to a second sample due to a combination of sampling variations, sociocultural/linguistic context and applied methodology (for example, see Chen et al.[42] or Gaskin et al.[43]). Besides those subtle variations in item distribution and in line with Kean et al.'s[16] conclusions, our results nevertheless show general support for the MPAI-4's subscale structure developed in previous psychometric studies: the French-Canadian MPAI-4 displays three subscales that represent domains broadly defined as Ability, Adjustment and Participation. Finally, given our EFA results, modifications to the tool (i.e. rearranging item order) so subscales' score calculation reflected the French-Canadian factor structure was considered. However, such a major change to the questionnaire would rather be detrimental, as comparison purpose with other studies using different versions of the MPAI-4 would no longer be possible.

Lastly, the translation and validation of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 was of primary importance, given the critical lack of available assessment tools for TBI sequelae in French for use in French-Canadian rehabilitation settings. The access to not only a standardized tool, but one that has been translated and validated in the primary language of the setting, allows measuring more accurately TBI patients' impairments, progress and outcomes. The need to validate the MPAI-4 in a French-Canadian sub-population is also in line with recommendations made by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention[44] regarding the importance of conducting validation studies of outcome measures among sub-populations in order to expand scientific knowledge of outcomes and establish best practices. Moreover, INESSS-ONF Clinical Practice Guidelines in TBI rehabilitation[21] also prescribe standardized evaluations of patients' condition using validated assessment tools in order to orient interventions. The use of the validated French-Canadian MPAI-4 with its specific reference norms will indeed allow professionals to apply best

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Study Limitations

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

Conclusions

Using an exploratory factor analysis on data from the French-Canadian version of the MPAI-4 and a Canadian sample of TBI adults receiving rehabilitation services, three factors were extracted and are similar to the three subscales found in the original MPAI-4. Small differences in item distribution across factors can be explained in part by sociocultural and clinical differences between the Canadian and American samples used to establish the factor structure of the questionnaire. The factor labels suggested by Malec[6] also suited the extracted factors and were thus retained for the French-Canadian MPAI-4 (i.e. Ability, Adjustment,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Azouvi, P., Arnould, A., Dromer, E., & Vallat-Azouvi, C. (2017). Neuropsychology of traumatic brain injury: An expert overview. *Revue Neurologique, 173(7-8),* 461–472. doi:10.1016/j.neurol.2017.07.006

2. Bennett, S., & Bennett, J. W. (2000). The process of evidence-based practice in occupational therapy: Informing clinical decisions. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 47(4),* 171–180. doi:10.1046/j.1440-1630.2000.00237.x.

3. Stiers, W., Carlozzi, N., Cernich, A., Velozo, C., Pape, T., Hart, T., … Whiteneck, G. (2012). Measurement of social participation outcomes in rehabilitation of veterans with traumatic brain injury. *The Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development, 49(1),* 139-154. doi:10.1682/jrrd.2010.07.0131

4. Cattelani, R., Corsini, D., Posteraro, L., Agosti, M., & Saccavini, M. (2009). The Italian version of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory-4. A new measure of brain injury outcome. *European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine, 45(4),* 513–519.

5. Chung, P., Yun, S., & Khan, F. (2014). A comparison of participation outcome measures and the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health Core Sets for traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine, 46(2),* 108–116. doi:10.2340/16501977-1257

6. Malec, J. F. (2005). The Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory [Questionnaire]. The Center for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. Retrieved from http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai

7. Lezak, M. D. (1987). Relationships between personality disorders, social disturbances, and physical disability following traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Head Trauma*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Rehabilitation, 2(1), 57–69. doi:10.1097/00001199-198703000-00009

8. Malec, J. F., & Thompson, J. M. (1994). Relationship of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory to functional outcome and cognitive performance measures. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 9(4),* 1–15. doi:10.1097/00001199-199412000-00003

9. Malec, J. F., Kragness, M., Evans, R. W., Finlay, K. L., Kent, A., & Lezak, M. D. (2003). Further psychometric evaluation and revision of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory in a national sample. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 18(6),* 479–492. doi:10.1097/00001199-200311000-00002.

10. Ashley, J. G., Ashley, M. J., Masel, B. E., Randle, K., Kreber, L. A., Singh, C., … Griesbach, G. S. (2018). The influence of post-acute rehabilitation length of stay on traumatic brain injury outcome: a retrospective exploratory study. *Brain Injury, 32(5),* 600–607. doi:10.1080/02699052.2018.1432896

11. Curran, C., Dorstyn, D., Polychronis, C., & Denson, L. (2014). Functional outcomes of community-based brain injury rehabilitation clients. *Brain Injury, 29(1),* 25–32. doi:10.3109/02699052.2014.948067

12. Dharm-Datta, S., Gough, M. R. C., Porter, P. J., Duncan-Anderson, J., Olivier, E., McGilloway, E., & Etherington, J. (2015). Successful outcomes following neurorehabilitation in military traumatic brain injury patients in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 79,* S197–S203. doi:10.1097/ta.0000000000000721

13. Hux, K. (2019). Post-acute rehabilitation effects on functional outcome and discharge disposition of people with severe traumatic brain injury. *Brain injury, 33(10),* 1332–1340. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699052.2019.1641745

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

14. Scott, K. L., Strong, C.-A. H., Gorter, B., & Donders, J. (2016). Predictors of post-concussion rehabilitation outcomes at three-month follow-up. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 30(1),* 66–81. doi:10.1080/13854046.2015.1127427

15. Jackson, D., Seaman, K., Sharp, K., Singer, R., Wagland, J., & Turner-Stokes, L. (2017). Staged residential post-acute rehabilitation for adults following acquired brain injury: A comparison of functional gains rated on the UK Functional Assessment Measure (UK FIM+FAM) and the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI-4). *Brain injury, 31(11),* 1405–1413. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699052.2017.1350998

16. Kean, J., Malec, J. F., Altman, I. M., & Swick, S. (2011). Rasch measurement analysis of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI-4) in a community-based rehabilitation sample. *Journal of Neurotrauma, 28(5),* 745–753. https://doi.org/10.1089/neu.2010.1573

17. Lewis, F. D., Horn, G. J., & Russell, R. (2017). Examination of post-hospital residential brain injury rehabilitation outcomes across the age spectrum. *International Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 5(1),* 1-6. doi:10.4172/2329-9096.1000390

18. Malec, J. F. (2004). Comparability of Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory ratings by staff, significant others and people with acquired brain injury. *Brain Injury, 18(6),* 563–575. doi:10.1080/02699050310001646134

19. McCauley, S. R., Wilde, E. A., Anderson, V. A., Bedell, G., Beers, S. R., Campbell, T. F., … Yeates, K. O. (2012). Recommendations for the use of common outcome measures in pediatric traumatic brain injury research. *Journal of Neurotrauma, 29(4),* 678–705. doi:10.1089/neu.2011.1838

20. Wilde, E. A., Whiteneck, G. G., Bogner, J., Bushnik, T., Cifu, D. X., Dikmen, S., … von Steinbuechel, N. (2010). Recommendations for the use of common outcome measures in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

traumatic brain injury research. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 91(11),* 1650–1660.e17. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2010.06.033

21. Bayley, M., Swaine, B., Lamontagne, M.-E., Marshall, S., Allaire, A.-S., Kua, A., et al. (2016). *INESSS-ONF clinical practice guideline for the rehabilitation of adults with moderate to severe traumatic brain injury.* Toronto, ON: Ontario Neurotrauma Foundation.

22. Malec, J. F., Moessner, A. M., Kragness, M., & Lezak, M. D. (2000). Refining a measure of brain injury sequelae to predict postacute rehabilitation outcome: Rating scale analysis of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 15(1),* 670–682. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001199-200002000-00006

23. Bohac, D., Malec, J., & Moessner, A. (1997). Factor analysis of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory: Structure and validity. *Brain Injury, 11(7),* 469–482. doi:10.1080/713802185

24. Altman, I. M., Swick, S., Parrot, D., & Malec, J. F. (2010). Effectiveness of community-based rehabilitation after traumatic brain injury for 489 program completers compared with those precipitously discharged. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 91(11),* 1697–1704. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2010.08.001

25. Altman, I. M., Swick, S., & Malec, J. F. (2013). Effectiveness of home- and community-based rehabilitation in a large cohort of patients disabled by cerebrovascular accident: Evidence of a dose-response relationship. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 94(9),* 1837–1841. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2013.02.014

26. Eicher, V., Murphy, M. P., Murphy, T. F., & Malec, J. F. (2012). Progress assessed with the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory in 604 participants in 4 types of post–inpatient

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

rehabilitation brain injury programs. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 93(1),* 100–107. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2011.06.038

27. Malec, J. F. (2001). Impact of comprehensive day treatment on societal participation for persons with acquired brain injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 82(7),* 885–895. doi:10.1053/apmr.2001.23895.

28. Malec, J. F., & Kean, J. (2016). Post-inpatient brain injury rehabilitation outcomes: Report from the National Outcome Info Database. *Journal of Neurotrauma, 33(14),* 1371–1379. doi:10.1089/neu.2015.4080

29. Ford, C. E. L., Malley, D., Bateman, A., Clare, I. C. H., Wagner, A. P., & Gracey, F. (2016). Selection and visualisation of outcome measures for complex post-acute acquired brain injury rehabilitation interventions. *NeuroRehabilitation, 39(1),* 65–79. doi:10.3233/nre-161339

30. Malec, J. F., Kean, J., Altman, I. M., & Swick, S. (2012). Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory: Comparing psychometrics in cerebrovascular accident to traumatic brain injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 93(12),* 2271–2275. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2012.06.013

31. Hamed, R., Tariah, H. A., Malkawi, S., & Holm, M. B. (2012). The Arabic version of the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory 4. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 35(3),* 243–247. doi:10.1097/mrr.0b013e3283544c9f

32. The Center for Outcome Measurement In Brain Injury. (2020). *Introduction to the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory.* Retrieved from http://www.tbims.org/mpai/

33. McKerral, M., Léveillé, G., Goulet, P., Vincent, P., & Laliberté, S. (2014). MPAI-4 Version canadienne-française [Questionnaire]. The Center for Outcome Measurement in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Brain Injury. Retrieved from http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai

34. McKerral, M., Léveillé, G., Goulet, P., & Vincent, P. (2014). *Manuel MPAI-4 Version canadienne-française.* The Center for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. Retrieved from http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai

35. Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20(1),* 141–151. doi:10.1177/001316446002000116

36. Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

37. Pituch, K. A., & Stevens, J. P. (2015). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (6th ed.). London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

38. Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

39. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

40. Kline, P. (2000). *The handbook of psychological testing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

41. Malec, J. F., & Lezak, M. (2008). *Manual for the Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI-4) for adults, children and adolescents*. The Center for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. Retrieved from http://www.tbims.org/combi/mpai

42. Chen, P.-Y., Yang, C.-M., & Morin, C. M. (2015). Validating the cross-cultural factor structure and invariance property of the Insomnia Severity Index: Evidence based on ordinal EFA and CFA. *Sleep Medicine, 16(5),* 598–603. doi:10.1016/j.sleep.2014.11.016

43. Gaskin, C. J., Lambert, S. D., Bowe, S. J., & Orellana, L. (2017). Why sample selection

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

matters in exploratory factor analysis: Implications for the 12-item World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 17(1),* 1-9. doi:10.1186/s12874-017-0309-5

44. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015). *Report to congress on traumatic brain injury in the United States: Epidemiology and rehabilitation.* Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/traumaticbraininjury/pdf/tbi_report_to_congress_epi_and_rehab-a.pdf

45. Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). London: Guilford Press.

46. Sousa, V. D., & Rojjanasrirat, W. (2011). Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: A clear and user-friendly guideline. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 17(2),* 268–274. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01434.x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219956; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure Legend

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



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

Table 1

Patients' sociodemographic and clinical characteristics

	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

Table 2

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

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

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

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

511

Table S1a

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

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**

Note. N/A T score = Raw score not obtained within the sample. According to Malec and Lezak[41]: T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average or typical of people involved in outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T scores between 40 and 50 may be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity compared to other people with ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the moderate to severe range compared to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would suggest severe limitations even as compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and 40 suggest mild limitations, and T scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

Table S1b

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

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**

Note. N/A T score = Raw score not obtained within the sample. According to Malec and Lezak[41]: T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average or typical of people involved in outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T scores between 40 and 50 may be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity compared to other people with ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the moderate to severe range compared to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would suggest severe limitations even as compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and 40 suggest mild limitations, and T scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

Table S1c

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

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**		

Note. N/A T score = Raw score not obtained within the sample. According to Malec and Lezak[41]: T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average or typical of people involved in outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T scores between 40 and 50 may be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity compared to other people with ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the moderate to severe range compared to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would suggest severe limitations even as compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and 40 suggest mild limitations, and T scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

Table S1d

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

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**		

Note. According to Malec and Lezak[41]: T scores between 40 and 60 would be considered average or typical of people involved in outpatient rehabilitation following acquired brain injury (ABI); T scores between 40 and 50 may be considered in the mild to moderate range of overall severity compared to other people with ABI; T scores between 50 and 60, may be considered in the moderate to severe range compared to other people with ABI. Hence, T scores above 60 would suggest severe limitations even as compared to other people with ABI, T scores between 30 and 40 suggest mild limitations, and T scores below 30 represent relatively good outcomes.

Table S2a

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

	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)

Table S2b

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

	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)

Table S2c

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

	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)

Table S2d

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

	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)

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, Gillaspy, & 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.

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).	✓ No missing data, as mentioned in the Results section.
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.	N/A (no CFA was conducted).
Include your scale (items and response options) in an appendix.	French-Canadian version of the MPAI-4 can be found on the COMBI website, as mentioned in the Introduction.
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).	✓ See Discussion section.
Discuss directions for future research (e.g., if appropriate, testing your scale for measurement invariance by conducting CFA on different populations).	✓ See Discussion section.
Reporting Guidelines for Exploratory Factor Analysis	
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).	✓ Sample size (N = 1012) is appropriate for EFA of the French-Canadian MPAI-4 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).
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).	✓ Sample size (N = 1012) is appropriate for conducting an EFA. No additional data collection was necessary due to inadequate sample size.

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..	✓ See Results section.
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.	✓ See Table 2.
Criteria for deleting (cross-loaded) items. Report any deleted items and the criteria used for deletion. Cross-loading items with values ≥ .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.	✓ See Results section. Cross-loading items were retained in order to maintain the questionnaire's integrity.
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).	✓ See Results section.
Explained variance. Report the variance explained by the factors.	✓ See Table 2.
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.	✓ As much as possible, given the maximum word limit.

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.