

## Promoting physical activity for disabled people who are ready to become physically active:

Jaarsma, Eva; Smith, Brett

DOI:

[10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.010)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Jaarsma, E & Smith, B 2017, 'Promoting physical activity for disabled people who are ready to become physically active: a systematic review', *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.010>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Table 3. Quality assessment of included studies.

Author, year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14**	15	16	Total %
Arbour-Nicitopoulos et al., 2009	0	3	2	3	0	3	2	1	2	3	na	3	3	na	1	3	69,05
Arbour-Nicitopoulos et al., 2014	2	2	1	1	0	3	2	1	2	3	na	3	2	na	1	3	61,90
Cardinal et al., 2004	3	3	1	3	0	2	2	2	1	2	na	2	2	na	0	3	61,90
Gernigon et al., 2015	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	2	2	2	na	2	2	na	0	3	47,62
Jaarsma, Geertzen, de Jong et al., 2014	3	3	3	1	3	2	1	2	1	2	na	2	2	na	0	3	66,67
Jaarsma, Dekker, Koopmans et al., 2014	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	na	2	2	na	1	3	71,43
Keegan et al., 2012	3	3	2	3	0	2	0	1	3	2	na	2	3	na	0	3	64,29
Kennedy et al., 2006	0	2	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	na	1	3	48,89
Kosma et al., 2004	3	3	2	0	0	2	1	1	3	3	na	3	3	na	0	2	61,90
Latimer et al., 2006	1	3	2	0	3	3	2	2	3	3	na	3	3	na	0	3	73,81
Latimer et al., 2004	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	na	3	3	na	2	3	85,71
Martin Ginis et al., 2013	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	na	2	2	na	0	3	61,90
Molton et al., 2008	3	3	2	1	0	3	0	3	2	3	na	3	2	na	0	3	66,67
Pelletier et al., 2014	2	3	3	0	0	3	1	1	2	2	na	2	1	na	0	3	54,76
Perrier et al., 2012	3	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	na	3	3	na	0	2	73,81
Perrier et al., 2015	3	3	1	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	na	3	3	na	0	3	80,95
Saebu & Sorensen, 2011	3	3	2	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	na	2	2	na	0	3	61,90
Sweet et al., 2012	3	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	2	2	na	3	2	na	0	3	61,90
Thomas et al., 2011	2	2	1	3	0	3	2	2	1	3	na	2	1	na	0	2	57,14
Warms et al., 2004	0	3	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	na	1	1	na	1	3	38,10
	71,67	93,33	61,67	43,33	30,00	81,67	50,00	53,33	65,00	81,67	1,67	80,00	71,67	na	11,67	95,00	

\*Criteria for quality assessment are: 1) explicit theoretical framework 2) Statement of aims/objectives in main body of report 3) Clear description of research setting 4) Evidence of sample size considered in terms of analysis 5) Representative sample of target group of a reasonable size 6) Description of procedure for data collection 7) Rationale for choice of data collection tool(s) 8) Detailed recruitment data 9) Statistical assessment of reliability and validity of measurement tool(s) (quantitative only) 10) Fit between stated research question and method of data collection (quantitative) 11) fit between stated research and format and content of data collection eg interview schedule (qualitative) 12) Fit between research question and method of analysis 13) Good justification for analytic method selected 14) Assessment of reliability of analytical process (qualitative only) 15) Evidence of user involvement on design 16) Strengths and limitations critically discussed

\*\* Criteria 14 was excluded from the quality assessment