# Summary table reporting evidence of Test-retest reliability for OMERACT Filter 2.3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study Reference**(Author, Year) | **Study description** | **Results** | **Judgement** |
| **Brief characteristics of sample\*** | **Characteristics of testing situation** | **Interpretation of authors of adequacy****(+, +/-, -)** | **Scores at baseline and retest** | **Statistic used** | **Results** | **Minimal detectable change (95%CI)***SEM=SDbaseline x Ö (1-ICC)**MDC=1.96 x SEM x Ö2* | **Interpretation of authors of adequacy****(+, +/-, -)** |
| ***EXAMPLE:*** |
| *adapted from Leung 2021)**Tillett 2020* | *Consecutive patients wth PsA fulfilled CASPAR, recruited for validation of composite measures* | * *1 week apart*
* *Assumed no change in condition*

*1* | * *140 patients recruited, 31 for test-retest reliability*
* *Mean age 54 (11) years*

*Duration of PsA 5.7 (4.7) years* | *Mean (SD)**T1: 0.49 (0.59)**T2: 0.50 (0.65)**Mean difference=-0.004 (SD=0.28),* *p=0.96* *95% CI:* *-0.114 to 0.105* | *ICC (2,1)**Spearman’s rho (r)* | *ICC (2,1)=0.94* *(95% CI: 0.88-0.97)**r=0.93 (p<0.01)* | *SEM=0.59 x Ö (1-0.94)**=0.14**MDC=1.96 x 0.14 x Ö2**= 0.39* | *(+)**Good ICC and correlation between scores that changes were not expected. Bland/ Altman plot provided supportive evidence.* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*\*Greater detail on study design & methods can be provided in the table, ‘Description of studies in general’*

\*add more rows as necessary
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(Example adapted from: Leung et al. HAQ-DI and the SF-36 Physical Functioning subscale provisionally endorsed as outcome measurement instruments of the physical function domain in psoriatic arthritis using OMERACT Filter 2.1 methodology. 2021 Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism)