

University of Wollongong

Research Online

Australian Health Outcomes Collaboration -
AHOC

Centre for Health Service Development - CHSD

May 2005

Instrument Review - SF-36® Health Survey (Version 1.0) for use in Australia

N. Marosszeky

University of Wollongong, marossz@uow.edu.au

J. Sansoni

University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/ahoc>

Recommended Citation

Marosszeky, N. and Sansoni, J., "Instrument Review - SF-36® Health Survey (Version 1.0) for use in Australia" (2005). *Australian Health Outcomes Collaboration - AHOC*. 2.
<https://ro.uow.edu.au/ahoc/2>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

SF-36[®] Health Survey (Version 1.0)

Title: SF-36[®] Health Survey (Version 1.0)
for use in Australia
(also known as the Medical Outcomes Study (MOS) 36-Item Short Form Health Survey).

Abbreviations: SF-36

Author(s) Name: John E. Ware, Jr.

Author(s) Address: QualityMetric Incorporated
640 George Washington Highway
Lincoln, RI 02865
USA

www.qualitymetric.com

Supplied by: QualityMetric Incorporated
640 George Washington Highway
Lincoln, RI 02865
USA

In Australia, SF-36[®] Health Survey manuals can be obtained from the:

Australian Health Outcomes Collaboration (AHOC)
c/- Centre for Health Service Development
University of Wollongong
NSW 2522
Phone: 02 4221-4411

Cost: An annual license fee applies for the use of the SF-36[®] Health Survey.

Survey users are required to register with QualityMetric Incorporated and obtain a quote for the annual license fee that applies to their project.

The license charge will depend upon whether users require a commercial or research license.

Register online at www.qualitymetric.com. Information of the SF group of instruments can also be found at <http://www.sf-36.com/>

SF-36[®] manuals can be purchased in Australia from AHOC by contacting Laura Willmott at willmott@uow.edu.au or by telephone on 02 4221-4411.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

For technical questions about using the SF-36[®] Health Survey in Australia (including latest developments and research advice) contact Jan Sansoni at jansan@netspeed.com.au or by telephone on 02 6291-7271 or 02 6205-0869.

Training requirements:	Nil training is required for those professionals with qualifications and experience in psychometrics and statistics. For those professionals without these qualifications basic training is required in survey administration and the characteristics of the SF-36 [®] Health Survey. The AHOC provides training workshops for the SF-36 and other instruments.
Purpose:	The SF-36 [®] Health Survey is a generic outcome measure designed to examine a person's perceived health status.
Administration time:	5 – 10 minutes.
Instrument Type:	Self-report Questionnaire.
Structure:	<p>The SF-36[®] Health Survey includes one multi-item scale measuring each of the following eight health concepts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) physical functioning; (2) role limitations because of physical health problems; (3) bodily pain; (4) social functioning; (5) general mental health (psychological distress and psychological well-being); (6) role limitations because of emotional problems; (7) vitality (energy/fatigue); and (8) general health perceptions.¹ <p>The SF-36 also includes a single-item measure of health transition or change.² The SF-36 can also be divided into two aggregate summary measures the Physical Component Summary (PCS) and the Mental Component Summary (MCS).³ (In the standard version of the SF-36 all scale questions refer to a 4 week time period.)</p>
Scoring:	<p>The SF-36[®] Health Survey items and scales were constructed using the Likert method of summated ratings.⁴ Answers to each question are scored (some items need to be recoded). These scores are then summed to produce raw scale scores for each health concept which are then transformed to a 0 – 100 scale. Scoring algorithms can then be applied to produce the PCS and MCS scores.⁵ (These two summary scores have the major advantage of being norm based. They also have reduced floor and ceiling effects.)</p>



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

Developed for:

The SF-36[®] Health Survey developed out of work on the Medical Outcomes Study or RAND Health Insurance Experiment.^{6,7} It is a short-form derived from a larger 149-item instrument and is more precise than its predecessor the SF-20.^{7,8}

Normative Data:

Australian data for the SF-36[®] Health Survey is provided by Stevenson (1996)⁹ and from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1997),¹⁰ 1995 National Health Survey. *(These are the accepted norms for use in Australia.)* Additional population health data using the SF-36 can be found in the 1996 Australian Longitudinal Study on Women's Health (Women's Health Australia),¹¹ the 1999-2000 Australian Diabetes, Obesity and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab),¹² the 1998 National Drug Strategy Household Survey,¹³ the 1991 – 2003 South Australian Health Omnibus Surveys,¹⁴ the 2002 National Study of Health, Intimacy and Social Relations.¹⁵ (Key questions from the SF-36 were also used in the 1997 + 1998 NSW Health Surveys¹⁶ and the 1999 NSW Older People's Health Survey.)¹⁷

US Data for the SF-36 can be found in Ware, Kosinski & Keller (1994)¹⁸ and Ware, Kosinski, Bayliss, McHorney, Rogers & Raczek (1995).³

UK Data for the SF-36 can be found at Jenkinson, Coulter & Wright (1993)¹⁹ and Bowling, Bond, Jenkinson & Lamping (1999).²⁰

World Data for the SF-36 in order to make cross country comparisons can be found at Ware, Gandek, Kosinski, Aaronson, Apolone, Brazier et al. (1998).²¹

Clinical Data:

A few clinical studies are listed below:

Arthritis: Hill, Parsons, Taylor & Leach (1999).²²

Asthma: Adams, Wakefield, Wilson, Parsons, Campbell, Smith et al. (2001).²³

Cardiac Rehabilitation: Jette & Downing (1994).²⁴

Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: Komaroff, Fagioli, Doolittle, Gandek, Gleit, Guerriero, et al. (1996).²⁵

Chronic Pain: Elliott, Renier & Palcher (2003).²⁶

Constipation: Tuteja, Talley, Joos, Woehl & Hickam (2005).²⁷

Crohn's Disease: Lichtenstein, Yan, Bala & Hanauer (2004).²⁸

Dry Eye: Mertzanis, Abetz, Rajagopalan, Espindle, Chalmers, Snyder et al. (2005).²⁹



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

Geriatrics: Weinberger, Nagle, Hanlon, Samsa, Schmader, Landsman et al. (1994),³⁰ Cohen, Feussner, Weinberger, Carnes, Hamdy, Hsieh et al. (2002)³¹ and Inaba, Goecke, Sharkey & Brennehan (2003).³²

Growth Hormone Deficiency: McMillan, Bradley, Gibney, Russell-Jones & Sonksen (2003).³³

Hip or Knee Replacement for Osteoarthritis: March, Cross, Lapsley, Brnabic, Tribe, Bachmeier et al. (1999).³⁴

Intensive Care: Cuthbertson, Scott, Strachan, Kilonzo & Vale (2005).³⁵

Kidney Diseases: Kurtin, Davies, Meyer, DeGiacomo & Kantz (1992)³⁶ and Chow, Briganti, Kerr, Chadban, Zimmet & Atkins (2003).¹²

Kidney Donors: Smith, Trauer, Kerr, Chadban (2003).³⁷

Knee Replacement: Bombardier, Melfi, Paul, Green, Hawker, Wright et al. (1995).³⁸

Lumbar Discectomy: Sun, Wang, Endow & Delamarter (2004).³⁹

Mental Health: Sherbourne, Wells & Ludd (1996)⁴⁰ and Goldney, Fisher, Wilson & Cheok (2001),⁴¹ Feld, Colantonio, Yoshida & Odette (2003),⁴² and Sciolla, Patterson, Wetherell, McAdams, Jeste (2003).⁴³

Multiple Sclerosis and Parkinson's Disease: Riazi, Hobart, Lamping, Fitzpatrick, Freeman, Jenkinson et al. (2003).⁴⁴

Scoliosis: Schwab, Dubey, Pagala, Gamez & Farcy (2003).⁴⁵

Seizure Disorders: Szaflarski & Szaflarski (2004).⁴⁶

Sexual Health: Patel, Boselli, Cairo, Barnett, Price & Wulf (2001).⁴⁷

Sleep Problems: Manocchia, Keller & Ware (2001).⁴⁸

Stroke: Anderson, Laubscher & Burns (1996),⁴⁹ Anderson, Rubenach, Mhurchu, Clark, Spencer & Winsor (2000)⁵⁰ and Middleton, Donnelly, Harris, Lusby & Ward (2002).⁵¹

Substance Abuse and Treatment: Ryan & White (1996),⁵² McGregor, Machin & White (2003),⁵³ Morgan, Morgenstern, Blanchard, Labouvie & Bux (2003)⁵⁴ and Freeman (2003).⁵⁵

Transplant Patients: Beilby, Moss-Morris & Painter (2003).⁵⁶



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

Upper Respiratory Tract Infection: Linder & Singer (2003).⁵⁷

Venous Disease: Kaplan, Criqui, Denenberg, Bergan & Fronck (2003).⁵⁸

The ACT Care Continuum and Health Outcomes Project⁵⁹ is a useful source of Australian clinical data for hospitalised patients.

Applications:

Outcome studies using the SF-36[®] Health Survey are not restricted to the Doctor's waiting room, but can be also administered via mail-out survey or telephone interview.⁶⁰⁻⁶² The SF-36 can also be used in a computerised format.⁶³

Interpretation guidelines and cautions are also available.^{48,64-68} One clear recommendation from the literature is that SF-36 Summary Scores (PCS + MCS) should be compared with the eight SF-36 Scale Scores before interpretation.⁶⁹

An acute (1 week) version of the SF-36[®] Health Survey is also available.

Rasch Analysis, a form of Item Response Theory, has also been applied to the SF-36 10-item Physical Functioning Scale (PF-10) with good result and future application⁷⁰⁻⁷² (especially for the use of computerised adaptive testing with patients).⁷³

Recently, QualityMetric Incorporated has developed an improved version of the SF-36[®] Health Survey known as the SF-36v2[™] Health Survey (Version 2).⁷⁴ This new version of the SF-36 has refinements to layout, item wording and response categories,⁷⁵ as well as norm based scoring for all of the eight SF-36 health concept scales (not just for the summary scores: PCS + MCS). The SF-36 Version 2 also uses new norms – 1998 general US population. Interim norms for Australia will shortly be available for this instrument from the 2004 South Australian Health Omnibus Survey and those interested should contact Professor Graeme Hawthorne at graemeeh@unimelb.edu.au or by telephone on 03 9496-4031.

Finally, a new paper by Walters (2004) analyses four different methods for calculating sample size and power estimates for studies using the SF-36.⁷⁶

See also the Instrument Review of the SF-12[®] Health Survey.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)

CHSD

Centre for Health Service Development

Instrument Review

RELIABILITY	Studies reported Yes / No	References	Adequacy Weak / Adequate / Good	Comment
Internal consistency	Yes	McHorney et al. (1994) ² Ware, Kosinski & Keller (1994) ¹⁸ McCallum (1995) ⁷ Stevenson (1996) ⁹ Gandek et al. (1998) ⁷⁷ Sanson-Fisher & Perkins (1998) ⁷⁸ Gandek et al. (2004) ⁷⁹	Good	
Test – retest	Yes	Ware, Kosinski & Keller (1994) ¹⁸ Bowling (1995) ⁸⁰ Sanson-Fisher & Perkins (1998) ⁷⁸ Kagee (2001) ⁵ Hopman et al. (2004) ⁸¹	Adequate	More information could be published on this aspect of the SF-36's reliability. (Cronbach's Alpha is used to construct the SEM for the SF-36 Summary scores. Cronbach's Alpha: PCS = 0.92; MCS = 0.91)
Inter – rater	NA	NA	NA	The SF-36 is a self-report measure.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)

CHSD

Centre for Health Service Development

Instrument Review

VALIDITY	Studies reported Yes / No	References	Adequacy Weak / Adequate / Good	Comment
Discriminatory Power	Yes	Komaroff et al. (1996) ²⁵ Shadbolt, McCallum & Singh (1997) ⁵⁹ Kagee (2001) ⁵	Adequate	See also the references in the Construct Validity section.
Correlation with other measures	Yes	Beaton, Hogg-Johnson & Bombardier (1997) ⁸² Prieto et al. (1997) ⁸³ Essink-Bot et al. (1997) ⁸⁴ Kagee (2001) ⁵ Stewart et al. (2003) ⁸⁵ Calsyn et al. (2004) ⁸⁶	Good	
Construct	Yes	Tarlov et al (1989) ⁶ McHorney et al. (1992) ⁸⁷ McHorney, Ware & Raczek (1993) ⁸ McHorney et al. (1994) ² Ware et al. (1995) ³ Keller et al. (1998) ⁸⁸ Ware et al. (1998) ⁸⁹ Jenkinson (1999) ⁹⁰	Good	



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

VALIDITY (Cont.)	Studies reported Yes / No	References	Adequacy Weak / Adequate / Good	Comment
Criterion	Yes	Jenkinson, Wright, Coulter (1994) ⁹¹ Kagee (2001) ⁵ Elliott et al. (2003) ²⁶	Adequate	

RESPONSIVENESS	Studies reported Yes / No	References	Adequacy Weak / Adequate / Good	Comment
Sensitivity to change	Yes	Jenkinson, Peto & Coulter (1994) ⁹² Jenkinson et al. (1995) ⁹³ Jenkinson et al. (1997) ⁹⁴ Sharples et al. (2000) ⁹⁵ Ferguson, Robinson & Splaine (2002) ⁶⁸ Beilby et al. (2003) ⁵⁶ Lichtenstein et al. (2004) ²⁸ Cuthbertson et al. (2005) ³⁵	Adequate	

Cultural Applicability and Cultural Adaptations:

The SF-36[®] Health Survey has been translated into many languages⁹⁶⁻⁹⁷ and its content examined cross culturally.⁹⁸ In Australia, the SF-36 has been utilised for people from a non-English speaking background in Western Sydney⁹⁹ and a large group of new Vietnamese migrants.¹⁰⁰ However, limited research has been reported with Aboriginal and Torres



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

Strait Islanders. (A recent paper by Scott, Sarfali, Tobias & Haslett [2000]¹⁰¹ may provide a useful template for future work in this area.)

Gender Appropriateness: Normative data is available for males and females.

Age Appropriateness: 14 years and over.

Summary: The SF-36 is a highly recommended measure with superior psychometric properties. It has been used extensively in Australia for both population health and clinical research.

References

1. Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36 Item Short Form Health Survey (SF 36). 1. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care* 1992; 30:473-483.
2. McHorney CA, Ware JE, Jr., Lu JFR, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36 Item Short Form Health Survey (SF 36): 3. Tests of data quality, scaling assumptions, and reliability across diverse patient groups. *Medical Care* 1994; 32:40-66.
3. Ware JE, Jr., Kosinski M, Bayliss MS, McHorney CA, Rogers WH, Raczek A. Comparison of methods for the scoring and statistical analysis of SF 36 Health Profile and Summary Measures: Summary of results from the Medical Outcomes Study. *Medical Care* 1995; 33:AS264-AS279.
4. Ware JE, Jr., Hays RD. Methods for measuring patient satisfaction with specific medical encounters. *Medical Care* 1988; 26:393-402.
5. Kagee A. Review of the SF-36 Health Survey. In Plake BS & Impara, JC. (Eds). *The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook*. 2001; Lincoln NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
6. Tarlov AR, Ware JE, Jr., Greenfield S, Nelson EC, Perrin E, Zubkoff M. The Medical Outcomes Study: An application of methods for monitoring the results of medical care. *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* 1989; 262:925-930.
7. McCallum J. The SF 36 in an Australian sample: validating a new, generic health status measure. *Australian Journal of Public Health* 1995; 19:160-166.
8. McHorney CA, Ware JE, Jr., Raczek AE. The MOS 36 Item Short Form Health Survey (SF36): 2. Psychometric and clinical tests of validity measuring physical and mental health constructs. *Medical Care* 1993; 31:247-263.
9. Stevenson CE. *SF 36: Interim norms for Australian data*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 1996.
10. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *1995 National Health Survey: SF-36 population norms, Australia*. (Cat. No. 4399.0) Canberra: ABS, 1997.
11. Mishra G, Schofield MJ. Norms for the physical and mental health component summary scores for the SF-36 for young, middle-aged and older Australian women. *Quality of Life Research* 1998; 7:215-220.
12. Chow FY, Briganti EM, Kerr PG, Chadban SJ, Zimmet PZ, Atkins RC. Health-related quality of life in Australian adults with renal insufficiency: a population-based study. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases* 2003; 41:596-604.
13. Adhikari P, Summerill A. *1998 National Drug Strategy Household Survey: Detailed findings*. (AIHW Cat. No. PHE 27) Canberra: AIHW, 2000.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

14. Behavioural Epidemiology Unit. *South Australian Population Norms for the Short Form 36 (SF-36) Health Status Questionnaire*. Adelaide: South Australian Health Commission, 1995.
15. Purdie DM, Dunne MP, Boyle FM, Cook MD, Najman JM. Health and demographic characteristics of respondents in an Australian national sexuality survey: comparison with population norms. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 2002; 56:748-753.
16. NSW Health Department. *Report on the 1997 and 1998 NSW Health Surveys*. NSW Health Department, Sydney, 2000. Available at: <http://www.health.nsw.gov.au/public-health/nswhs/hsindex.htm>. Accessed (June 2003).
17. NSW Health Department. New South Wales Older People's Health Survey 1999. *NSW Public Health Bulletin* 2000; 11(S-2):1-62.
18. Ware JE, Jr., Kosinski M, Keller SD. *SF 36 Physical and Mental Health Summary Scales: A User's Manual*. MA: The Health Institute, New England Medical Center, 1994.
19. Jenkinson C, Coulter A, Wright L. Short form 36 (SF 36) health survey questionnaire: Normative data for adults of working age. *British Medical Journal* 1993; 306:1437-1440.
20. Bowling A, Bond M, Jenkinson C, Lamping DL. Short Form 36 (SF-36) Health Survey questionnaire: which normative data should be used ? Comparisons between the norms provided by the Omnibus Survey in Britain, the Health Survey for England and the Oxford Healthy Life Survey. *Journal of Public Health Medicine* 1999; 21:255-270.
21. Ware JE, Jr., Gandek B, Kosinski M, Aaronson NK, Apolone G, Brazier J et al. The equivalence of SF-36 summary health scores estimated using standard and country-specific algorithms in 10 countries: results from the IQOLA Project. International Quality of Life Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:1167-1170.
22. Hill CL, Parsons J, Taylor A, Leach G. Health related quality of life in a population sample with arthritis. *Journal of Rheumatology* 1999; 26:2029-2035.
23. Adams R, Wakefield M, Wilson D, Parsons J, Campbell D, Smith B, et al. Quality of life in asthma: a comparison of community and hospital asthma patients. *Journal of Asthma* 2001; 38:205-214.
24. Jette DU, Downing J. Health status of individuals entering a cardiac rehabilitation program as measured by the Medical Outcomes Study 36 item Short Form survey (SF 36). *Physical Therapy* 1994; 74:521-527.
25. Komaroff AL, Fagioli LR, Doolittle TH, Gandek B, Gleit MA, Guerriero RT, et al. Health status in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome and in general population and disease comparison groups. *American Journal of Medicine* 1996; 101:281-290.
26. Elliott TE, Renier CM, Palcher JA. Chronic pain, depression, and quality of life: correlations and predictive value of the SF-36. *Pain Medicine* 2003; 4:331-339.
27. Tuteja AK, Talley NJ, Joos SK, Woehl JV, Hickam DH. Is constipation associated with decrease physical activity in normally active subjects ? *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 2005; 100:124-129.
28. Lichtenstein GR, Yan S, Bala M, Hanauer S. Remission in patients with Crohn's disease is associated with improvements in employment and quality of life and a decrease in hospitalisations and surgeries. *American Journal of Gastroenterology* 2004; 99:91-96.
29. Mertzanis P, Abetz L, Rajagopalan K, Espindle D, Chalmers R, Snyder C et al. The relative burden of dry eye in patients' lives: comparisons to a US normative sample. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science* 2005; 46:46-50.
30. Weinberger M, Nagle B, Hanlon JT, Samsa GP, Schmadar K, Landsman PB, et al. Assessing health related quality of life in elderly outpatients: Telephone versus face to face administration. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 1994; 42:1295-1299.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

31. Cohen HJ, Feussner JR, Weinberger M, Carnes M, Hamdy RC, Hsieh F et al. A controlled trial of inpatient and outpatient geriatric evaluation and management. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2002; 346:905-912.
32. Inaba K, Goecke M, Sharkey P, Brenneman F. Long-term outcomes after injury in the elderly. *Journal of Trauma-Injury Infection & Critical Care* 2003; 54:486-491.
33. McMillan CV, Bradley C, Gibney J, Russell-Jones DL, Sonksen PH. Evaluation of two health status measures in adults with growth hormone deficiency. *Clinical Endocrinology* 2003; 58:436-445.
34. March LM, Cross MJ, Lapsley H, Brnabic AJ, Tribe KL, Bachmeier CJ et al. Outcomes after hip or knee surgery for osteoarthritis. A prospective cohort study comparing patients' quality of life before and after surgery with age-related population norms. *Medical Journal of Australia* 1999; 171:235-238.
35. Cuthbertson BH, Scott J, Strachan M, Kilonzo M, Vale L. Quality of life before and after intensive care. *Anaesthesia* 2005; 60:332-339.
36. Kurtin PS, Davies AR, Meyer KB, DeGiacomo JM, Kantz ME. Patient based health status measures in outpatient dialysis: Early experiences in developing an outcomes assessment program. *Medical Care* 1992; 30:MS136-MS149.
37. Smith GC, Trauer T, Kerr PG, Chadban SJ. Prospective psychosocial monitoring of living kidney donors using the SF-36 health survey. *Transplantation* 2003; 76:807-809.
38. Bombardier C, Melfi CA, Paul J, Green R, Hawker G, Wright J, et al. Comparison of a generic and a disease specific measure of pain and physical function after knee replacement surgery. *Medical Care* 1995; 4:AS131-AS144.
39. Sun EC, Wang JC, Endow K, Delamarter RB. Adjacent two-level lumbar discectomy: outcome and SF-36 functional assessment. *Spine* 2004; 29:E22-E27.
40. Sherbourne CD, Wells KB, Ludd LL. Functioning and well being of patients with panic disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1996; 153:213-218.
41. Goldney RD, Fisher LJ, Wilson DH, Cheok F. Suicidal ideation and health related quality of life in the community. *Medical Journal of Australia* 2001; 175:546-549.
42. Feld R, Colantonio A, Yoshida K, Odette F. Mental health and vitality among Canadian women with physical disabilities. *Psychological Reports* 2003; 93:75-83.
43. Sciolla A, Patterson TL, Wetherell JL, McAdams LA, Jeste DV. Functioning and well-being of middle-aged and older patients with schizophrenia: measurement with the 36-item short-form (SF-36) health survey. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 2003; 11:629-637.
44. Riazi A, Hobart JC, Lamping DL, Fitzpatrick R, Freeman JA, Jenkinson C et al. Using the SF-36 measure to compare the health impact of multiple sclerosis and Parkinson's disease with normal population health profiles. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* 2003; 74:710-714.
45. Schwab F, Dubey A, Pagala M, Gamez L, Farcy JP. Adult scoliosis: a health assessment analysis by SF-36. *Spine* 2003; 28:602-606.
46. Szaflarski JP, Szaflarski M. Seizure disorders, depression, and health-related quality of life. *Epilepsy & Behavior* 2004; 5:50-57.
47. Patel R, Boselli F, Cairo I, Barnett G, Price M, Wulf HC. Patient's perspectives on the burden of recurrent genital herpes. *International Journal of STD and AIDS* 2001; 12:640-645.
48. Manocchia M, Keller S, Ware JE. Sleep problems, health-related quality of life, work functioning and health care utilization among the chronically ill. *Quality of Life Research* 2001; 10:331-345.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

49. Anderson C, Laubscher S, Burns R. Validation of the Short Form 36 (SF 36) Health Survey Questionnaire among stroke patients. *Stroke* 1996; 27:1812-1816.
50. Anderson C, Rubenach S, Mhurchu CN, Clark M, Spencer C, Winsor A. Home or hospital for stroke rehabilitation ? Results of a randomized controlled trial: 1. Health outcomes at 6 months. *Stroke* 2000; 31:1024-1031.
51. Middleton S, Donnelly N, Harris J, Lusby R, Ward J. Audit of long-term mortality and morbidity outcomes for carotid endarterectomy. *Australian Health Review* 2002; 25:81-91.
52. Ryan CF, White JM. Health status at entry to methadone maintenance treatment using the SF-36 health survey questionnaire. *Addiction* 1996; 91:39-45.
53. McGregor C, Machin A, White JM. In-patient benzodiazepine withdrawal: comparison of fixed and symptom-triggered taper methods. *Drug & Alcohol Review* 2003; 22:175-180.
54. Morgan TJ, Morgenstern J, Blanchard KA, Labouvie E, Bux DA. Health-related quality of life for adults participating in outpatient substance abuse treatment. *American Journal of Addictions* 2003; 12: 98-210.
55. Freeman K. Health and well-being outcomes for drug-dependent offenders on the NSW Drug Court programme. *Drug & Alcohol Review* 2003; 22:409-416.
56. Beilby S, Moss-Morris R, Painter L. Quality of life before and after heart, lung and liver transplantation. *New Zealand Medical Journal* 2003; 116:U381.
57. Linder JA, Singer DE. Health-related quality of life of adults with upper respiratory tract infections. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2003; 18:802-807.
58. Kaplan RM, Criqui MH, Denenberg JO, Bergan J, Fronek A. Quality of life in patients with chronic venous disease: San Diego population study. *Journal of Vascular Surgery* 2003; 37:1047-1053.
59. Shadbolt B, McCallum J, Singh M. Health outcomes by self-report: validity of the SF-36 among Australian hospital patients. *Quality of Life Research* 1997; 6:343-352.
60. McHorney CA, Kosinski M, Ware JE, Jr. Comparisons of the costs and quality of norms for the SF 36 Health Survey collected by mail versus telephone interview: Results from a national survey. *Medical Care* 1994; 32:551-567.
61. Watson EK, Firman DW, Baade PD, Ring I. Telephone administration of the SF-36 Health Survey: validation studies and population norms for adults in Queensland. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 1996; 20:359-363.
62. Perkins JJ, Sanson-Fisher RW. An examination of self- and telephone-administered modes of administration for the Australian SF-36. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:969-973.
63. Ryan JM, Corry JR, Attewell R, Smithson MJ. A comparison of an electronic version of the SF-36 General Health Questionnaire to the standard paper version. *Quality of Life Research* 2002; 11:19-26.
64. Wetzler Hp, Lum DL, Bush DM. Using the SF-36 health survey in primary care. In Maruish ME. (Editor) *Handbook of psychological assessment in primary care settings*. 2000; Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
65. Jenkinson C. The SF-36 physical and mental summary measures: an example of how to interpret scores. *Journal of Health Services & Research Policy* 1998; 3:92-96.
66. Diehr P, Patrick DL, Spertus J, Kiefe CI, McDonell M, Fihn SD. Transforming self-rated health and the SF-36 scales to include death and improve interpretability. *Medical Care* 2001; 39:670-680.
67. Wilson D, Parsons J, Tucker G. The SF-36 summary scales: problems and solutions. *Sozial- und Praventivmedizin* 2000; 45:239-246.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

68. Ferguson RJ, Robinson AB, Splaine M. Use of the Reliable Change Index to evaluate clinical significance in SF-36 outcomes. *Quality of Life Research* 2002; 11:509-516.
69. Ware JE, Kosinski, M. Interpreting SF-36 summary health measures: a response. *Quality of Life Research* 2001; 10:405-413.
70. McHorney CA, Haley SM, Ware JE, Jr., Evaluation of the MOS SF-36 Physical Functioning Scale (PF-10): II. Comparison of relative precision using Likert and Rasch scoring methods. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1997; 50:451-461.
71. Raczek AE, Ware JE, Bjorner JB, Gandek B, Haley SM, Aaronson NK et al. Comparison of Rasch and summated rating scales constructed from SF-36 physical functioning items in seven countries: results from the IQOLA Project. International Quality of Life Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:1203-1214.
72. Jenkinson C, Fitzpatrick R, Garratt A, Peto V, Stewart-Brown S. Can item response theory reduce patient burden when measuring health status in neurological disorders ? Results from Rasch analysis of the SF-36 physical functioning scale (PF-10). *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry* 2001; 71:220-224.
73. Ware JE, Jr., Bjorner JB, Kosinski M. Response to Hays et al and McHorney and Cohen: Practical implications of Item Response Theory and Computerized Adaptive Testing: A brief summary of ongoing studies of widely used Headache Impact Scales. *Medical Care* 2000; 38:Supplement (2)73-82.
74. Jenkinson C, Stewart-Brown S, Petersen S, Paice C. Assessment of the SF-36 version 2 in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 1999; 53:46-50.
75. Kazis LE, Miller DR, Clark JA, Skinner KM, Lee A, Ren XS et al. Improving the response choices on the veterans SF-36 health survey role functioning scales: results from the Veterans Health Study. *Journal of Ambulatory Care Management* 2004; 27:263-280.
76. Walters SJ. Sample size and power estimation for studies with health related quality of life outcomes: a comparison of four methods using the SF-36. *Health & Quality of Life Outcomes* 2004; 2:26.
77. Gandek B, Ware JE, Jr., Aaronson NK, Alonso J, Apolone G, Bjorner J et al. Tests of data quality, scaling assumptions, and reliability of the SF-36 in eleven countries: results from the IQOLA Project. International Quality of Life Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:1149-1158.
78. Sanson-Fisher RW, Perkins JJ. Adaptation and validation of the SF-36 Health Survey for use in Australia. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:961-967.
79. Gandek B, Sinclair SJ, Kosinski M, Ware JE, Jr. Psychometric evaluation of the SF-36 health survey in Medicare managed care. *Health Care Financing Review* 2004; 25:5-25.
80. Bowling A. *Measuring Disease: A Review of Disease Specific Quality of Life Measurement Scales*. 1995; Buckingham: Open University Press.
81. Hopman WM, Berger C, Joseph L, Towheed T, vandenKerkhof E, Anastassiades T et al. Stability of normative data for the SF-36: results of a three-year prospective study in middle aged Canadians. *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 2004; 95:387-391.
82. Beaton DE, Hogg-Johnson S, Bombardier C. Evaluating changes in health status: Reliability and responsiveness of five generic health status measures in workers with musculoskeletal disorders. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1997; 50:73-93.
83. Prieto L, Alonson J, Ferrer M, Antò JM. Are results of the SF 36 Health Survey and the Nottingham Health Profile similar?: A comparison in COPD patients. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1997; 50:463-473.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

84. Essink-Bot ML, Krabbe PFM, Bonsel GJ, Aaronson NK. An empirical comparison of four generic health status measures: The Nottingham Health Profile, the Medical Outcomes Study 36 Item Short Form, the COOP/WONCA Charts, and the EuroQol Instrument. *Medical Care* 1997; 35:522-537.
85. Stewart KJ, Turner KL, Bacher AC, DeRegis JR, Sung J, Tayack M et al. Are fitness, activity, and fatness associated with health-related quality of life and mood in older persons ? *Journal of Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation* 2003; 23:115-121.
86. Calsyn DA, Saxon AJ, Bush KR, Howell DN, Baer JS, Sloan KL et al. The Addiction Severity Index medical and psychiatric composite scores measure similar domains as the SF-36 in substance-dependent veterans: Concurrent and discriminant validity. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence* 2004; 76:165-171.
87. McHorney CA, Ware JE, Jr., Rogers W, Raczek AE, Lu JFR. The validity and relative precision of MOS Short and Long Form Health Status Scales and Dartmouth COOP Charts. *Medical Care* 1992; 30:MS253-MS265.
88. Keller SD, Ware JE, Jr., Bentler PM, Aaronson NK, Alonso J, Apolone G et al. Use of structural equation modelling to test the construct validity of the SF-36 Health Survey in ten countries: results from the IQOLA Project. International Quality of Life Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:1179-1188.
89. Ware JE, Jr., Kosinski M, Gandek B, Aaronson NK, Apolone G, Bech P et al. The factor structure of the SF-36 Health Survey in 10 countries: results from the IQOLA Project. International Quality of Life Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:1159-1165.
90. Jenkinson C. Comparison of UK and US methods for weighting and scoring the SF-36 summary measures. *Journal of Public Health Medicine* 1999; 21:372-376.
91. Jenkinson C, Wright L, Coulter A. Criterion validity and reliability of the SF 36 in a population sample. *Quality of Life Research* 1994; 3:7-12.
92. Jenkinson C, Peto V, Coulter A. Measuring change over time: a comparison of results from a global single item of health status and the multi dimensional SF 36 health status survey questionnaire in patients presenting with menorrhagia. *Quality of Life Research* 1994; 3:317-321.
93. Jenkinson C, Lawrence K, McWhinnie D, Gordon J. Sensitivity to change of health status measures in a randomized controlled trial: Comparison of the COOP charts and the SF 36. *Quality of Life Research* 1995; 4:47-52.
94. Jenkinson C, Gray A, Doll H, Lawrence K, Keoghane S, Layte R. Evaluation of index and profile measures of health status in a randomized controlled trial. Comparison of the Medical Outcomes Study 36-Item Short Form Health Survey, EuroQol, and disease specific measures. *Medical Care* 1997; 35:1109-1118.
95. Sharples LD, Todd CJ, Caine N, Tait S. Measurement properties of the Nottingham Health Profile and Short Form 36 Health status measures in a population sample of elderly people living at home. Results from ELPHS. *British Journal of Health Psychology* 2000; 5:217-233.
96. Bullinger M, Alonso J, Apolone G, Leplege A, Sullivan M, Wood-Dauphinee S et al. Translating health status questionnaires and evaluating their quality: the IQOLA Project approach. International Quality of Life Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:913-923.
97. Perneger TV, Lepledge A, Etter JF. Cross-cultural adaptation of a psychometric instrument: two methods compared. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1999; 52:1037-1046.
98. Wagner AK, Gandek B, Aaronson NK, Acquadro C, Alonso J, Apolone G et al. Cross-cultural comparisons of the content of SF-36 translations across 10 countries: results from the IQOLA Project. International Quality of Life Assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 1998; 51:925-932.
99. Cardona M, Jorm L, Williamson M, Chey T. *The Blacktown Health Survey of People from Non English Speaking Background*. 1995; Western Sector Public Health Unit.



Australian Health Outcomes
Collaboration (AHOC)



Instrument Review

100. Watkins RE, Plant AJ, Sang D, O'Rourke T, Gushulak B. Development of a Vietnamese version of the Short form-36 Health Survey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Public Health* 2000; 12:118-123.
101. Scott KM, Sarfali D, Tobias MI, Martin I, Haslett, SJ. A challenge to the cross-cultural validity of the SF-36 health survey: Factor structure in Maori, Pacific and New Zealand ethnic groups. *Social Science & Medicine* 2000; 51:1655-1664.

Reporter: Nicholas Marosszeky, Research Psychologist

Date of report 30 May 2005

With additional comments by Jan Sansoni

This review was written as a part of the Continence Outcomes Measurement Suite research project, funded by the Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing, National Continence Management Strategy.