|  |
| --- |
| **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL C.** Inter- and intrarater reliability of included studies |
| **Study** | **Interrater**  | **Intrarater**  |
| Ageberg et al | -Kappa 0.92, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.08. -PA 96%. |  |
| Barker-Davis et al  | **Composite scores:**-ICC(1.1)=0.419 | **Composite scores:**-ICC(1.1)=0.672 |
| Chmielewski et al (Unilateral Squat)  | **Overall method scoring system:**-Weighted Kappa 0.00-0.37.-Generalized Kappa 0.01, 95% CI -0.27 to 0.25.-PA 41-60%.**Specific method scoring system:**- Weighted Kappa 0.29-0.42.-Generalized Kappa 0.18, 95% CI 0.04 to 0.32.- PA 32-41%. | **Overall method scoring system:**- Weighted Kappa 0.18-0.42.- PA 60-64%.**Specific method scoring system:**- Weighted Kappa 0.35-0.53- PA 32-48%. |
| Chmielewski et al (Lateral Step-Down) | **Overall method scoring system:**-Weighted Kappa 0.21-0.55-Generalized Kappa 0.19, 95% CI -0.15 to 0.53.-PA 55-82%.**Specific method scoring system:**- Weighted Kappa 0.23-0.53.-Generalized Kappa 0.22, 95% CI 0.07 to 0.36.- PA 20-50%. | **Overall method scoring system:**- Weighted Kappa 0.13-0.50.- PA 56-76%.**Specific method scoring system:** - Weighted Kappa 0.56-0.68- PA 40-60%. |
| Cornell et al  |  | **Right leg:**-Foot; PABAK 0.57, PA 78%-Knee in; PABAK 0.74, PA 87%-Knee out; PABAK 1.0, PA 100%-Trunk; PABAK 0.83, PA 91%-Balance; PABAK 0.65, PA 83%.**Left leg:**-Foot; PABAK 0.57, PA 78%-Knee in; PABAK 1.0, PA 100%-Knee out; PABAK 1.0, PA 100%-Trunk; PABAK 0.65, PA 83%-Balance; PABAK 0.91, PA 86%. |
| Crossley et al  | **Consensus panel vs. experienced physical therapists:**-Kappa 0.700-0.800.-PA 80-87%.**Consensus panel vs. the least experienced physical therapist:**-Kappa 0.600.-PA 73%. | -Kappa 0.613-0.800.-PA 73-87%. |
| DiMattia et al  | **Knee valgus:** -Kappa 0.28.-PA 66.6%.**Hip adduction:** -Kappa 0.016.-PA 71.3%. |  |
| Edmondston et al  | **Dominant leg:**-Kappa 0.63.-PA 87%.**Non-dominant leg:**-Kappa 0.47.-PA 93%. |  |
| Friedrich et al  | ICC (1,1) 0.14, 95% CI 0.00 to 0.44. |  |
| Frohm et al | ICC 0.5, Measurement error 0.61. |  |
| Gianola et al | **Generalized weighted Kappa:**-Time point 0; 0.34, 95% CI 0.28 to 0.41-Time point 1; 0.31, 95% CI 0.23 to 0.38-Time point 2; 0.30, 95% CI 0.23 to 0.37**Weighted Kappa, range 6 raters:**-Lowest; 0.24 95% CI 0.09 to 0.39-Highest; 0.61 95% CI 0.46 to 0.76 | **Generalized weighted Kappa:**-Rater 1; 0.61, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.72-Rater 2; 0.85, 95% CI 0.79 to 0.92-Rater 3; 0.55, 95% CI 0.44 to 0.65-Rater 4; 0.80, 95% CI 0.73 to 0.87-Rater 5; 0.70, 95% CI 0.61 to 0.79-Rater 6; 0.83, 95% CI 0.77 to 0.90 |
| Harris-Hayes et al  | **Experienced tester 1:** -Weighted Kappa 0.90 (95% CI 0.77 to 1.0). -PA 93% (95% CI 83 to 100).**Experienced tester 2:** -Weighted Kappa 0.75 (95% CI 0.54 to 0.96).-PA 83% (95% CI 68 to 98).**Novice tester:** -Weighted Kappa 0.75 (95% CI 054 to 0.96).-PA 83% (95% CI 68 to 98). | **Experienced tester 1:** Weighted Kappa 0.80 (95% CI 0.61 to 0.99). -PA 87% (95% CI 73 to 100).**Experienced tester 2:** -Weighted Kappa 0.90 (95% CI 0.77 to 1.0). -PA 93% (95% CI 83 to 100).**Novice tester:** -Weighted Kappa 0.84 (95% CI 0.67 to 1.0).-PA 90% (95% CI 78 to 100). |
| Herman et al  | **Overall agreement:** -ICC 0.61, PA 73.83%.**Experience (year):** 0-1= ICC 0.61, PA 66.67%.1-5=ICC 0.59, PA 78.33%>5=ICC 0.59, PA 73.40%.No difference in PA between groups, P=0.141**Familiar:** -Yes= ICC 0.62, PA 78.08%. -No= ICC 0.57, PA 69.32%. Significantly greater PA in the familiar group, P=0.004.**Training:** -Yes=ICC 0.60, PA 75.23%. -No= ICC 0.50, PA 72.38 %.No difference in PA between groups, P=0.345.Familiar group versus training group: No difference regardless familiarity and training, P=0.884 |  |
| Junge et al  | -Linear weighted kappa 0.54-0.86.-Un-weighted kappa 0.52-0.88.-PABAK 0.50-0.94.-Quadratic weighted kappa 0.76-0.95.-Overall agreement 0.86-0.97%. |  |
| Kaukinen et al  | **Weighted Kappa, 95% CI and PA:**-Index knee: 0.52 (0.34-0.69), 76%-Contralateral knee: 0.43 (0.23-0.62), 73%. | **Weighted Kappa, 95% CI and PA:**-Index knee: 0.73 (0.56-0.90), 88%-Contralateral knee: 0.66 (0.46-0.85), 88%. |
| Kennedy et al  | **Most significant limiting factor:** **-**Kappa 0.26-0.37**Regardless limiting factor:** **-**Kappa 0.4-0.62**.** | **Most significant limiting factor:** Kappa 0.31-0.53. |
| Lenzlinger-Asprion et al  | -Weighted Kappa 0.66, 95 % CI 0.46-0.86.-PA 70%. | **Tester A:** -Weighted Kappa 0.78, 95 % CI 0.64-0.93.-PA 77%**Tester B:** -Weighted Kappa 0.61, 95 % CI 0.40–0.82.-PA 70%. |
| McKeown et al  | **Left leg:**-Average kappa 0.53.**Right leg:**-Average kappa 0.58. | **Left leg:**-Average ICC 0.75.**Right leg:**-Average ICC 0.80. |
| Nae et al  | **Within-task scoring system:** -Weighted kappa, 95% CI; 0.664 (0.369-0.958)**-Segment-specific scoring system, weighted kappa, 95% CI:** -Foot pronation- 0.517 (0.276-0.758).Medial knee to foot position- 0.592 (0.321-0.863)Hip/pelvic- 0.429 (0.128-0.729)Trunk- 0.524 (0.147-0.90) |  |
| Park et al  | -Kappa 0,80, 95% CI 0.57-1.0-PA 85% |  |
| Piva et al | -Kappa 0.67, 95% CI 0.58-0.76-PA 80% |  |
| Poulsen et al  | -Generalized weighted kappa 0.68, 95% CI 0.46-0.87.  | -Weighted kappa 0.38-0.94 |
| Rabin et al (2010) | -Kappa 0.59, 95% CI 0.26-0.91.-PA 83%. |  |
| Rabin et al (2014) | -Kappa 0.81, 95% CI 0.68–0.94.-PA 91% |  |
| Räisänen et al  | **Physiotherapist vs. non-experienced tester:**-Dominant leg=kappa 0.32, p <0.06.-Non-dominant leg=kappa 0.16, p=0.35. | **First year:** -Dominant leg; kappa 0.28, P=0.06; -Non-dominant leg; kappa 0.29, p=0.06**Second year:** -Dominant leg; kappa 0.60, p <0.01.-Non-dominant leg; kappa 0.64, p <0.001**Third year:** -Dominant leg; kappa 0.89, p <0.001.-Non-dominant leg; kappa 0.78, p <0.001**All years:** -Dominant leg; kappa 0.58, p <0.001; -Non-dominant leg; kappa 0.58, p <0.001 |
| Stensrud et al  |  | **Right leg:** kappa 0.43 **Left leg:** kappa 0.32 |
| Teyhen et al  | ICC 2,5=0.61, 95% CI 0.30-0.79 |  |
| Van Mastrigt et al  | **Among all raters:** -Linearly weighted kappa= 0.43, 95% CI 0.02–0.65.-Quadratically weighted kappa =0.57, 95% CI 0.14-0.80. -Generalized kappa =0.29 **Among surgeons:**-Linearly weighted kappa=0.51, 95% CI 0.44-0.61.-Quadratically weighted kappa= 0.68, 95% CI 0.62-0.74.-Generalized kappa= 0.32. |  |
| Weeks et al  | **Experienced physiotherapists:**-ICC 3,1=0.71**Physiotherapy students:**-ICC 3,1=0.60. | **Experienced physiotherapists:**-ICC 3,1=0.81, Range 0.66-0.87.**Physiotherapy students:**-ICC 3,1=0.71, Range 0.50-0.87.Neither physiotherapist nor student ratings differed significantly between the two occasions. |
| Weir et al (Unilateral Squat) | ICC 2,1=0.41, 95% CI 0.26-0.58 | ICC 2,1=0.55, 95% CI 0.45-0.64PA of all observers between the 2 observations 49%. |
| Weir et al (Lateral Step-Down) | ICC 2,1=0.39, 95% CI 0.23–0.57 | ICC 2,1=0.49, 95% CI 0.39–0.59PA of all observers between the 2 observations 47%. |
| Whatman et al   | **Percent agreement and AC1 (95% CI):****Knee rating:**All Physiotherapists: PA 73%, AC1 0.52 (0.41-0.65).Experience <5 year: PA 70%, AC1 0.44 (0.29-0.58).Experience 5-9 year: PA 72%, AC1 0.50 (0.37-0.63).Experience 10-14 year: PA 72%, AC1 0.50 (0.37-0.63).Experience >14 year: PA 75%, AC1 0.55 (0.40-0.70).**Pelvis rating:**All Physiotherapists: PA 73%, AC1 0.52 (0.42-0.62).Experience <5 year: PA 70%, AC1 0.47 (0.36-0.70).Experience 5-9 year: PA 75%, AC1 0.53 (0.36-0.70). Experience 10-14 year: PA 74%, AC1 0.54 (0.44-0.64).Experience >14 year: PA 74%, AC1 0.53 (0.42-0.65). | **Percent agreement and AC1 (mean range):****Knee rating:**All Physiotherapists (N=26): PA 83% (70-96), AC1 0.71 (0.41-0.95)Experience <10 year (N=9): PA 84% (70-96), AC1 0.71 (0.41-0.95)Experience >14 year (N=11): PA 84 % (74-91), AC1 0.71 (0.49-0.87)**Pelvis rating:**All Physiotherapists (N=26): PA 84% (70-100), AC1 0.73 (0.48-1.00)Experience <10 year (N=9): PA 83% (74-100), AC1 0.70 (0.48-1.00)Experience >14 year (N=11): PA 85% (70-96), AC1 0.74 (0.52-0.93). |
| Örtqvist et al  | -Kappa 0.57, 95% CI 0.30-0.85.-PA 79%. | -Kappa 0.48, 95% CI 0.16-0.79.-PA 76%. |
| Abbreviations: ICC, Intraclass correlation Coefficient; AC1, First order of agreement coefficient;PABAK, Prevalence-adjusted bias-adjusted kappa; PA, Percent Agreement; CI, Confidence Interval |