

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Self-efficacy instruments for individuals with coronary artery disease: a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062794
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Mar-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Almeida, Jose Alexandre; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Florêncio, Rêncio; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Lemos, Darllane; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Leite, Jéssica; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Physical Therapy Graduate Program Monteiro, Karolinne; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Peroni Gualdi, Lucien; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program
Keywords:	CARDIOLOGY, Coronary heart disease < CARDIOLOGY, Ischaemic heart disease < CARDIOLOGY, Myocardial infarction < CARDIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title:** Self-efficacy instruments for individuals with coronary artery disease: a systematic
4 review protocol.
5

6
7 **Authors:** José Alexandre Barbosa de Almeida¹, Rêncio Bento Florêncio², Darllane
8 Azevedo Lemos³, Jéssica Costa Leite⁴, Karolinne Souza Monteiro⁵, Lucien Peroni
9 Gualdi⁶.
10
11

12 **Affiliation:** ^{1,2,3} Master students, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program, Federal
13 University of Rio Grande do Norte, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil;⁴ Ph.D. Physical Therapy
14 Graduate Program, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, RN – Brazil; ^{5,6}
15 Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate
16 Program, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil.
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Corresponding author:** Lucien Peroni Gualdi – Programa de Pós Graduação em
23 Ciências da Reabilitação, Faculdade de Ciências da Saúde do Trairi, Rua Vila do Trairi
24 S/N, CEP: 59200-000, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil. E-mail address:
25 lugualdi@hotmail.com, Telephone: +55(84) 99480 6888.
26
27
28

29 **Financial support:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding
30 agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
31
32

33 **Word count:** 1.155.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Self-efficacy is associated with management of diseases, psychological well-being, improved quality of life, and rehabilitation adherence. Several instruments related to behavior or specific disease (e.g., coronary artery disease [CAD]) assess self-efficacy. The evaluation of cardiac self-efficacy in individuals with CAD will support healthcare professionals to improve self-efficacy in interventions; therefore, a suitable instrument is crucial. This systematic review aims to assess measurement properties, methodological quality, and content of outcome measures of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD.

Methods and analysis: The study will be developed according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P) and Consensus Norms for Selection of Health Measuring Instruments (COSMIN). Search strategy will be performed in the following databases: MEDLINE (ovid), Web of Science, EMBASE, and PsycINFO. Studies assessing measurement properties of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD and without language or date restrictions will be included. Two independent authors will be responsible for eligibility of studies. Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the COSMIN RoB Checklist, whereas the Classification of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Assessment (GRADE) will assess quality of each study. Another two authors will independently evaluate the content and link to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health.

Ethics and Dissemination: This study does not require ethics committee approval since it is based on previously published data. Evidence from this systematic review will be disseminated through publication in peer-reviewed journals of high scientific impact.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021262613.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- First systematic review evaluating instruments to assess cardiac self-efficacy in individuals with CAD.
- The review will use updated standards based on consensus (e.g., COSMIN) to select measurement instruments and report measurement properties of multiple validation studies.
- The review will allow researchers and healthcare professionals to choose validated patient-reported outcome measures according to measurement properties to improve assessment and rehabilitation programs.

- Published studies without language and date restrictions will be included to consider the maximum number of relevant studies.
- The extracted content from eligible measurement instruments will be compared to ICF core sets.

INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is defined as the belief of individuals about their ability to organize and perform a certain activity. It consists of elements of awareness, planning, and motivation, which can reflect on self-responsibility throughout the disease process;[1] thus, it is important for health promotion and management of chronic diseases.[1-3] Moreover, self-efficacy is associated with psychological well-being, improved quality of life, and better rehabilitation adherence.[4,5]

Measurement instruments of self-efficacy can be general[6], for specific health conditions (e.g., feeding behavior, physical activity, and medication adherence),[7- 9] or specific diseases (e.g., asthma, stroke, and coronary artery disease [CAD]).[10-13] Although many scales and questionnaires are available for self-efficacy, literature lacks methodological rigor and choice of instrument for individuals in pulmonary, metabolic, and cardiovascular rehabilitation programs.

CAD is characterized as reduced coronary artery lumen due to atherosclerotic plaques and may lead to chest pain, pressure or tightness sensation at different degrees of exertion, and dyspnea.[14, 15] Conventional treatment implies cardiovascular rehabilitation and changes in daily habits. The admission of individuals to cardiovascular rehabilitation programs aims to delay and prevent complications and improve physical fitness through aerobic and strength training.[16]

Therefore, instruments assessing self-efficacy are needed to prevent complications and increase treatment adherence.[1, 3] In this context, the assessment of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD will support healthcare professionals in individual interventions and improve self-efficacy of patients. This systematic review aims to identify instruments developed to assess cardiac self-efficacy in individuals with CAD and evaluate methodological quality and measurement properties. We also aim to

1
2
3 link the content of instruments to the International Classification of Functioning,
4 Disability, and Health (ICF). Based on this, the review will facilitate identifying
5 discrepancies in measurement instruments and guide further research.
6
7
8
9
10

11 **METHODS**

12 **Study method**

13
14
15 This systematic review will be developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for
16 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P)[17] and the Consensus-
17 based Standards for the Selection of Health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN).[18,
18 19]
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Protocol registration**

26
27 The protocol was registered in the international prospective register of systematic
28 reviews (PROSPERO registration number CRD42021262613). Relevant changes in the
29 systematic review will be documented in the PROSPERO and published in the final
30 study.
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

37
38 Studies on the development of assessment of measurement properties of cardiac self-
39 efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD will be included without language and
40 date restrictions. Clinical trials or validation studies using self-reported or proxy-
41 reported measurements and those published as abstracts will be excluded.
42
43
44
45

46 **Search strategy**

47
48 The search strategy will be conducted from inception to date in MEDLINE (ovid), Web
49 of Science, EMBASE and PsycINFO databases considering the following: (1) construct
50 of interest (cardiac self-efficacy); (2) target population (individuals with CAD); (3) type
51 of instrument (questionnaire or scale); and (4) measurement properties; the latter will be
52 assessed using search filters validated for measurement studies and already applied in
53 previous reviews. Additional searches for relevant studies will be manually performed
54 in reference lists of primary studies and review articles. Searches will be performed
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 again before final analysis to verify new studies. The Supplementary file 1 show the
4 search strategies we developed for the databases search. The study will follow COSMIN
5 recommendations.[20]
6
7

8 9 **Screening and selection of studies**

10
11 An online survey will be imported into a Mendeley reference manager list
12 (<https://www.mendeley.com>). Duplicates will be deleted before selections, and the
13 reference list exported to the Rayyan Qatar Computing Research Institute systematic
14 review platform (<https://rayyan.qcri.org>).[21] The detailed selection process will be
15 presented in the PRISMA-P flowchart.
16
17

18
19 Two independent authors (JABA and DAL) will select studies using titles and abstracts,
20 conduct a complete reading of potentially eligible studies, and identify and record
21 reasons for excluding those ineligible. In the case of disagreement, a virtual meeting
22 will be held for discussion and consultation with a third reviewer (LPG).
23
24

25 26 27 **Data extraction**

28
29 Two authors (JABA and DAL) will extract data following the Cochrane Collaboration
30 and PRISMA guidelines. Other authors will independently review data to verify
31 inclusion and exclusion criteria. The extracted information will include first author, year
32 of publication, general characteristics of the instrument (construct, subscales, number of
33 items, and version), study design, sample size, characteristics of individuals (e.g., age,
34 sex, location, country, language, methods for selecting participants, and response rate),
35 and results of measurement properties (i.e., internal consistency, reliability,
36 measurement error, content validity [including face validity], construct validity
37 [subdivided into structural validity, hypothesis testing, and cross-cultural validity],
38 validity of criterion, responsiveness, and interpretability [not a measurement property,
39 but necessary to adapt a research instrument or clinical practice]).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 **Data quality**

53
54 Methodological quality of studies will be assessed by two independent authors (RBF
55 and JCL) using COSMIN RoB Checklist.[18, 19] This tool considers ten measurement
56 properties and contains nine boxes with 3 to 35 items. Each box assigns a
57 methodological quality score for instrument development: (1) content validity, (2)
58
59
60

1
2
3 structural validity, (3) internal consistency, (4) cross-cultural validity and measurement
4 invariance, (5) reliability, (6) measurement error, (7) criterion validity, (8) hypothesis
5 testing for construct validity, and (9) responsiveness. Each item has four response
6 options: inadequate, doubtful, adequate, and very good.[22] Disagreements will be
7 solved by a third author (KSM).
8
9

10
11
12 The content extracted from measurement instruments will be compared using the ICF
13 framework.[23–25] Two independent authors (JABA and RBF) will evaluate the
14 content and link items of questionnaires to ICF standards. After, a third author (JCL)
15 will review the content.
16
17
18

19 20 21 **Data synthesis**

22
23 A narrative synthesis of results will be provided. Results and findings from different
24 studies will be summarized if measurement properties are from the same instrument. A
25 combination of measurement properties will determine the overall evidence of the
26 instrument. Studies will be grouped according to similarity in terms of language,
27 instrument version, study population, and application form.
28
29
30

31
32 Results will be evaluated in clusters or summarized against the criteria for good
33 measurement properties to determine whether they are sufficient (+), insufficient (-),
34 inconsistent (+/-), or indeterminate (?). Furthermore, a modified Classification of
35 Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and *Evaluation* (GRADE) will
36 determine study quality.[26, 27]
37
38
39

40
41
42 Afterward, instruments will be categorized and justified according to COSMIN
43 recommendations:[28] (A) instrument is recommended for use and results are reliable;
44 (B) when it may be recommended but requires further research to assess quality of these
45 instruments; and (C) instrument should not be recommended.
46
47
48

49 50 51 **Patient and public involvement**

52
53 The design of this protocol does not involve individuals or the public.
54

55 56 57 **Ethics and Dissemination**

58
59 The study does not require ethics committee approval since it is based on published
60 data. Evidence from this systematic review will be disseminated through publication of

1
2
3 results in peer-reviewed journals of high scientific impact and submitted to scientific
4 conferences.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **DISCUSSION**

11
12
13 This study is the first systematic review assessing measurement instruments for cardiac
14 self-efficacy in individuals with CAD. The study will provide scientific evidence of
15 existing tools through measurement analysis. Thus, results will highlight current gaps,
16 guide future research, allow healthcare professionals and researchers to choose the best
17 instrument for assessment, and facilitate referral of individuals to rehabilitation.
18
19

20
21
22 However, potential challenges may arise even following COSMIN guidelines and the
23 PRISMA-P protocol since studies only report some psychometric properties.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 **Contributors:** Authors made substantial contributions to the study design, developed
31 inclusion criteria, and search strategies. JABA developed the protocol, RBF, DAL, JCL,
32 KSM, and LPG provided critical insights and reviewed the protocol. JABA registered
33 the protocol in the PROSPERO database. All authors read and approved the final
34 version of the protocol.
35
36
37
38

39
40 **Funding Statement:** The study will be financed by the Coordenação de
41 Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Brazil. JABA, DAL and
42 RBF received grant from CAPES by Finance Code 001.
43
44

45
46 **Competing interests:** None declared.
47

48
49 **Patients consent for publication:** Not applicable.
50

51
52 **Provenance and peer review:** Not commissioned, externally peer-reviewed.
53

54
55 **Open access:** This is an open-access article distributed by the Creative Commons
56 Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which allows distribution,
57 remix, adapt, build upon this study non-commercially, and license the derivative studies
58 on different terms. Original study must be cited, given appropriate credit, any changes
59
60

1
2
3 must be indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See
4 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

5 6 7 **ORCID iDs:**

8
9
10 José Alexandre Barbosa de Almeida <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0876-6794>

11
12 Rêncio Bento Florêncio <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2853-7988>

13
14 Darllane Azevedo Lemos <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2020-3940>

15
16 Jéssica Costa Leite <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4726-9416>

17
18 Karolinne Souza Monteiro <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2254-8723>

19
20 Lucien Peroni Gualdi <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6907-7335>

21 22 23 24 25 **REFERENCES**

- 26
27
28 1 Bandura A. Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Educ*
29 *Behav* 2004;31:143–64. doi:10.1177/1090198104263660.
- 30
31
32 2 Roest AM, Martens EJ, Denollet J, *et al.* Prognostic association of anxiety
33 post myocardial infarction with mortality and new cardiac events: A meta-
34 analysis. *Psychosom Med* 2010;72:563–9
35 doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181dbff97
- 36
37
38 3 Bandura, A. Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran, *Encyclopedia of human*
39 *behavior*. New York: Academic Press. 1994.
- 40
41
42 4 Joekes K, Van Elderen T, Schreurs K. Self-efficacy and overprotection are
43 related to quality of life, psychological well-being and self-management in
44 cardiac patients. *J Health Psychol* 2007;12:4–16.
45 doi:10.1177/1359105306069096.
- 46
47
48 5 Katch H. The role of self-efficacy in cardiovascular disease self-
49 management: a review of effective programs. *Patient Intell* 2010;2:33-
50 44. doi:10.2147/PI.S12624
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 6 Luszczyńska A, Scholz U, Schwarzer R. The general self-efficacy scale:
4 Multicultural validation studies. *J Psychol* 2005;139:439-
5 57.doi:10.3200/JRLP.139.5.439-457.
6
7
8
9 7 Birkett NJ, Hotz SB. A self-efficacy scale for heart-healthy eating. *Can J*
10 *Public Health* 1994;85:201-4. PMID: 7922967.
11
12
13 8 Wong EML, Leung DYP, Sit JWH, *et al.* Prospective Validation of the
14 Chinese Version of the Self-Efficacy for Exercise Scale among Middle-
15 Aged Patients with Coronary Heart Disease. *Rehabil Nurs* 2020;45:74-
16 9.doi:10.1097/RNJ.0000000000000156.
17
18
19 9 Saffari M, Zeidi IM, Fridlund B, *et al.* A Persian Adaptation of Medication
20 Adherence Self-Efficacy Scale (MASSES) in Hypertensive Patients:
21 Psychometric Properties and Factor Structure. *High Blood Press*
22 *Cardiovasc Prev* 2015;22:247-55.doi:10.1007/s40292-015-0101-8.
23
24
25 10 Holley S, Knibb R, Latter S, *et al.* Development and validation of the
26 Adolescent Asthma Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (AASEQ). *Eur Respir J*
27 2019;54:1-10.doi:10.1183/13993003.01375-2018.
28
29
30 11 Topçu S, Oguz S. Translation and validation study for the stroke self -
31 efficacy questionnaire in stroke survivors. *Int J Nurs Pract* 2018;24:1-
32 8.doi:10.1111/ijn.12646.
33
34
35 12 Sullivan MD, Lacroix AZ, Russo J, *et al.* Self-efficacy and self-reported
36 functional status in coronary heart disease: A six-month prospective study.
37 *Psychosom Med* 1998;60:473-8.doi:10.1097/00006842-199807000-
38 00014.
39
40
41 13 Fors A, Ulin K, Cliffordson C, *et al.* The Cardiac Self-Efficacy Scale, a
42 useful tool with potential to evaluate person-centred care. *Eur J*
43 *Cardiovasc Nurs* 2015;14:536-43.doi:10.1177/1474515114548622.
44
45
46 14 Li H, Sun K, Zhao R, *et al.* Inflammatory biomarkers of coronary heart
47 disease. *Front Biosci (Schol Ed)* 2018;10:185-96.doi:10.2741/s508.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 15 Cagle SD, Cooperstein N. Coronary Artery Disease: Diagnosis and Management. *Prim Care* 2018;45:45–61.doi:10.1016/j.pop.2017.10.001
 - 16 Carvalho T, Milani M, Ferraz AS, *et al.* Brazilian Cardiovascular Rehabilitation Guideline – 2020. *Arq Bras Cardiol* 2020;114:943–87.doi:10.36660/abc.20200407.
 - 17 Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (prisma-p) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;349:1–25.doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647.
 - 18 Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Patrick DL, *et al.* The COSMIN checklist for assessing the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties of health status measurement instruments: an international Delphi study. *Qual Life Res* 2010;19:539–49.doi:10.1007/s11136-010-9606-8.
 - 19 Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Knol DL, *et al.* The COSMIN checklist for evaluating the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties: a clarification of its content. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2010;10:22.doi:10.1186/1471-2288-10-22.
 - 20 Terwee CB, Jansma EP, Riphagen II, *et al.* Development of a methodological PubMed search filter for finding studies on measurement properties of measurement instruments. *Qual Life Res* 2009;18:1115–23.doi:10.1007/s11136-009-9528-5.
 - 21 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al.* Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5:1–10.doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
 - 22 Mokkink LB, de Vet HCW, Prinsen CAC, *et al.* COSMIN Risk of Bias checklist for systematic reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures. *Qual Life Res.* 2018;27:1171-9.doi:10.1007/s11136-017-1765-4.
 - 23 Cieza A, Geyh S, Chatterji S, *et al.* ICF linking rules: An update based on lessons learned. *J Rehabil Med* 2005;37:212–8.doi:10.1080/16501970510040263.

- 1
2
3 24 Cieza A, Brockow T, Ewert T, *et al.* Linking health-status measurements
4 to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *J*
5 *Rehabil Med* 2002;34:205–10.doi:10.1080/165019702760279189.
6
7
8
9 25 Castro SS, Castaneda L, de Araújo ES, *et al.* Aferição de funcionalidade em
10 inquéritos de saúde no Brasil: Discussão sobre instrumentos baseados na
11 Classificação Internacional de Funcionalidade, Incapacidade e Saúde
12 (CIF). *Rev Bras Epidemiol* 2016;19:679–87.doi:10.1590/1980-
13 5497201600030018.
14
15
16
17
18 26 Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman AD, *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 14. Going
19 from evidence to recommendations: The significance and presentation of
20 recommendations. *J Clinl Epidemiol* 2013;66:719–
21 25.doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.03.013.
22
23
24
25
26 27 Andrews JC, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 15.
27 Going from evidence to recommendation - Determinants of a
28 recommendation's direction and strength. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66:726–
29 35.doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.02.003.
30
31
32
33
34 28 Mookink LB, Prinsen CAC, Patrick DL, *et al.* COSMIN methodology for
35 systematic reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) -
36 user manual Netherlands: COSMIN, 2018.
37 Available:[https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-](https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf)
38 [review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf](https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf) [Accessed 20
39 Dez 2021].
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1**Search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid)**

1. exp Self Efficacy/
2. self-efficacy.mp.
3. 1 or 2
4. exp Coronary Artery Disease/
5. Coronary Artery Disease.mp.
6. coronary heart disease.mp.
7. exp Coronary Disease/
8. exp Acute Coronary Syndrome/
9. Heart disease.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
10. exp heart diseases/
11. exp myocardial ischemia/
12. exp Cardiovascular Diseases/
13. Cardiovascular Disease.mp.
14. exp Heart Failure/
15. heart failure.mp.
16. 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15
17. instrument*.mp.
18. instruments*.mp.
19. measure*.mp.
20. measures*.mp.
21. questionnaire*.mp.
22. exp "Surveys and Questionnaires"/
23. questionnaires*.mp.
24. scale*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
25. scales*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
26. tool*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
27. tools*.mp.
28. survey*.mp.
29. test*.mp.
30. 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29
31. 3 and 16 and 30
32. (instrumentation or methods).fs.
33. (Validation Studies or Comparative Study).pt.

- 1
- 2
- 3 34. exp Psychometrics/
- 4 35. psychometr*.ti,ab.
- 5 36. (clinimetr* or clinometr*).tw.
- 6 37. outcome assessment.ti,ab.
- 7 38. outcome measure*.tw.
- 8 39. exp Observer Variation/
- 9 40. observer variation.ti,ab.
- 10 41. exp Health Status Indicators/
- 11 42. exp Reproducibility of Results/
- 12 43. reproducib*.ti,ab.
- 13 44. exp Discriminant Analysis/
- 14 45. (reliab* or unreliab* or valid* or coefficient or homogeneity or homogeneous or
- 15 internal consistency).ti,ab.
- 16 46. (cronbach* and (alpha or alphas)).ti,ab.
- 17 47. (item and (correlation* or selection* or reduction*)).ti,ab.
- 18 48. (agreement or precision or imprecision or precise values or test-retest).ti,ab.
- 19 49. (test and retest).ti,ab.
- 20 50. (reliab* and (test or retest)).ti,ab.
- 21 51. ((replicab* or repeated) and (measure or measures or findings or result or results or
- 22 test or tests)).ti,ab.
- 23 52. (generaliza* or generalisa* or concordance).ti,ab.
- 24 53. (intraclass and correlation*).ti,ab.
- 25 54. (discriminative or known group or factor analysis or factor analyses or dimension*
- 26 or subscale*).ti,ab.
- 27 55. (multitrait and scaling and (analysis or analyses)).ti,ab.
- 28 56. (item discriminant or interscale correlation* or error or errors or individual
- 29 variability).ti,ab.
- 30 57. (variability and (analysis or values)).ti,ab.
- 31 58. (uncertainty and (measurement or measuring)).ti,ab.
- 32 59. (standard error of measurement or sensitiv* or responsive*).ti,ab.
- 33 60. ((minimal or minimally or clinical or clinically) and (important or significant or
- 34 detectable) and (change or difference)).ti,ab.
- 35 61. (small* and (real or detectable) and (change or difference)).ti,ab.
- 36 62. (meaningful change or ceiling effect or floor effect or Item response model or IRT
- 37 or Rasch or Differential item functioning or DIF or computer adaptive testing or item
- 38 bank or cross-cultural equivalence).ti,ab.
- 39 63. exp Reproducibility of Results/
- 40 64. cross-cultural equivalence.ti,ab.
- 41 65. development.ti,ab.
- 42 66. 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 or 44 or 45 or 46
- 43 or 47 or 48 or 49 or 50 or 51 or 52 or 53 or 54 or 55 or 56 or 57 or 58 or 59 or 60 or
- 44 61 or 62 or 63 or 64 or 65
- 45 67. 31 and 66
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Search strategy for Web of Science

<i>n</i>	Search terms
#1	Search: TS=(Self-Efficacy*) OR TS=(Self Efficacy*)
#2	Search: TS=(Coronary Artery Disease*) OR TS=(Coronary Disease*) OR TS=(Coronary Heart Disease*) OR TS=(Acute Coronary Syndrome) OR TS=(Heart disease*) OR TS=(Cardiovascular disease*) OR TS=(Heart failure) OR TS=(Myocardial ischemia)
#3	Search: TS=(Instrument*) OR TS=(instruments*) OR TS=(measure*) OR TS=(measures*) OR TS=(questionnaire*) OR TS=(questionnaires*) OR TS=(scale*) OR TS=(scales*) OR TS=(tool*) OR TS=(tools*) OR TS=(survey*) OR TS=(test*)
#4	Search: TS=(instrumentation) OR TS=(methods) OR TS=(“validation stud*”) OR TS=(“comparative stud*”) OR TS=(psychometrics) OR TS=(psychometr*) OR ALL=(clinimetr*) OR ALL=(clinometr*) OR TS=(“outcome assessment”) OR TS=(“outcome measure”) OR TS=(“observer variation”) OR TS=(“observer variation”) OR TS=(“health status indicators”) OR TS=(“reproducib*”) OR TS=(“discriminant analysis”) OR TS=(reliab*) OR TS=(unreliab*) OR TS=(valid*) OR TS=(“coefficient of variation”) OR TS=(coefficient) OR TS=(homogeneity) OR TS=(homogeneous) OR TS=(“internal consistency”) OR ((TS=(alpha) OR TS=(alphas)) AND TS=(cronbach*)) OR ((TS=(correlation*) OR TS=(selection*) OR TS=(reduction*)) AND TS=(item)) OR TS=(agreement) OR TS=(precision) OR TS=(imprecision) OR TS=(precise values) OR TS=(test-retest) OR (TS=(test) AND TS=(retest)) OR ((TS=(test) OR TS=(retest)) AND TS=(reliab*)) OR TS=(stability) OR TS=(interrater) OR TS=(inter-rater) OR TS=(intrarater) OR TS=(intra-rater) OR TS=(intertester) OR TS=(inter-tester) OR TS=(intratester) OR TS=(intra-tester) OR TS=(interobserver) OR TS=(inter-observer) OR TS=(intraobserver) OR TS=(intra-observer) OR TS=(intertechician) OR TS=(inter-technician) OR TS=(intratechnician) OR TS=(intra-technician) OR TS=(interexaminer) OR TS=(inter-examiner) OR TS=(intraexaminer) OR TS=(intra-examiner) OR TS=(interassay) OR TS=(inter-assay) OR TS=(intraassay) OR TS=(intra-assay) OR TS=(interindividual) OR TS=(inter-individual) OR TS=(intraindividual) OR TS=(intra-individual) OR TS=(interparticipant) OR TS=(inter-participant) OR TS=(intraparticipant) OR TS=(intraparticipant) OR TS=(kappa) OR TS=(kappa’s) OR TS=(kappas) OR TS=(repeatable*) OR ((ALL=(replicab*) OR ALL=(repeated)) AND (ALL=(measure) OR ALL=(measures) OR ALL=(findings) OR ALL=(result) OR ALL=(results) OR ALL=(test) OR ALL=(tests))) OR TS=(generaliza*) OR TS=(generalisa*) OR TS=(concordance) OR (TS=(intraclass) AND TS=(correlation*)) OR TS=(discriminative) OR TS=(known group) OR TS=(“factor analysis”) OR TS=(“factor analyses”) OR TS=(“factor structure”) OR TS=(“factor structures”) OR TS=(dimension*) OR TS=(subscale*) OR ((TS=(analysis) OR TS=(analyses)) AND TS=(scaling) AND TS=(multitrait)) OR TS=(“item discriminant”) OR TS=(“interscale correlation*”) OR TS=(error) OR TS=(errors) OR TS=(“individual variability”) OR TS=(“interval variability”) OR TS=(“rate variability”) OR ((TS=(values) OR TS=(analysis)) AND TS=(variability)) OR ((TS=(measurement) OR TS=(measuring)) AND TS=(uncertainty)) OR TS=(“standard error of measurement”) OR TS=(sensitiv*) OR TS=(responsive*) OR (TS=(limit) AND TS=(detection)) OR TS=(“minimal detectable concentration”) OR TS=(interpretab*) OR ((TS=(minimal) OR TS=(minimally) OR TS=(clinical) OR TS=(clinically)) AND (TS=(important) OR TS=(significant) OR TS=(detectable)) AND (TS=(change) OR TS=(difference))) OR (TS=(small) AND (TS=(real) OR TS=(detectable)) AND (TS=(change) OR TS=(difference))) OR TS=(“meaningful change”) OR TS=(“ceiling effect”) OR TS=(“floor effect”) OR TS=(“Item response model”) OR TS=(IRT) OR TS=(Rasch) OR TS=(“differential item functioning”) OR TS=(DIF) OR TS=(“computer adaptive testing”) OR TS=(“item bank”) OR TS=(“cross-cultural equivalence”) OR TS=(“development”)
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Search strategy for Embase and PsycINFO

<i>n</i>	Search terms
#1	("Self-Efficacy*" OR "Self Efficacy*")
#2	("Coronary Artery Disease*" OR "Coronary Disease*" OR "Coronary Heart Disease*" OR "Acute Coronary Syndrome" OR "Heart disease*" OR "Cardiovascular disease*" OR "Heart failure" OR "Myocardial ischemia")
#3	("Instrument*" OR "Instruments*" OR "measure*" OR "measures*" OR "questionnaire*" OR "questionnaires" OR "scale*" OR "scales*" OR "tool*" OR "tools*" OR "survey*" OR "test*")
#4	("instrumentation" OR "methods" OR "Validation Studies" OR "Comparative Study" OR "psychometrics" OR "psychometr*" OR "clinimetr*" OR "clinometr*" OR "outcome assessment (health care)" OR "outcome assessment" OR "outcome measure*" OR "observer variation" OR "observer variation" OR "Health Status Indicators" OR "reproducibility of results" OR "reproducib*" OR "discriminant analysis" OR "reliab*" OR "unreliab*" OR "valid*" OR "coefficient of variation" OR "coefficient" OR "homogeneity" OR "homogeneous" OR "internal consistency" OR ("cronbach*" AND "alpha" OR "alphas") OR ("item" AND ("correlation*" OR "selection*" OR "reduction*")) OR "agreement" OR "precision" OR "imprecision" OR "precise values" OR "test-retest" OR ("test" AND "retest") OR ("reliab*" AND ("test" OR "retest")) OR "stability" OR "interrater" OR "inter-rater" OR "intrarater" OR "intra-rater" OR "intertester" OR "inter-tester" OR "intratester" OR "intra-tester" OR "interobserver" OR "inter-observer" OR "intraobserver" OR "intra-observer" OR "intertechnician" OR "inter-technician" OR "intratechnician" OR "intra-technician" OR "interexaminer" OR "inter-examiner" OR "intraexaminer" OR "intra-examiner" OR "interassay" OR "inter-assay" OR "intraassay" OR "intra-assay" OR "interindividual" OR "inter-individual" OR "intraindividual" OR "intra-individual" OR "interparticipant" OR "inter-participant" OR "intraparticipant" OR "intra-participant" OR "kappa" OR "kappa's" OR "kappas" OR "repeatab*" OR (("replicab*" OR "repeated") AND ("measure" OR "measures" OR "findings" OR "result" OR "results" OR "test" OR "tests")) OR "generaliza*" OR "generalisa*" OR "concordance" OR ("intraclass" AND "correlation*") OR "discriminative" OR "known group" OR "factor analysis" OR "factor analyses" OR "factor structure" OR "factor structures" OR "dimension*" OR "subscale*" OR ("multitrait" AND "scaling" AND ("analysis" OR "analyses")) OR "item discriminant" OR "interscale correlation*" OR "error" OR "errors" OR "individual variability" OR "interval variability" OR "rate variability" OR ("variability" AND ("analysis" OR "values")) OR ("uncertainty" AND ("measurement" OR "measuring")) OR "standard error of measurement" OR "sensitiv*" OR "responsive*" OR ("limit" AND "detection") OR "minimal detectable concentration" OR "interpretab*" OR (("minimal" OR "minimally" OR "clinical" OR "clinically") AND ("important" OR "significant" OR "detectable") AND ("change" OR "difference")) OR ("small*" AND ("real" OR "detectable") AND ("change" OR "difference")) OR "meaningful change" OR "ceiling effect" OR "floor effect" OR "Item response model" OR "IRT" OR "Rasch" OR "Differential item functioning" OR "DIF" OR "computer adaptive testing" OR "item bank" OR "cross-cultural equivalence" OR "development")
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review and meta analysis.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-Reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Title			
Identification	#1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	#1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	1
Registration			
	#2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3
Authors			
Contact	#3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1, 10
Contribution	#3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	9

Amendments

	#4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	n/a
--	--------------------	---	-----

Support

Sources	#5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	10
Sponsor	#5b	Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	n/a
Role of sponsor or funder	#5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	n/a

Introduction

Rationale	#6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	1,3
Objectives	#7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	3

Methods

Eligibility criteria	#8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	3
Information sources	#9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	4
Search strategy	#10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Supplementary file 1
Study records - data management	#11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	4,5
Study records - selection process	#11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review	4,5

(that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)

1			
2			
3	Study records -	#11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such
4	data collection		as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any
5	process		processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators
6			
7			
8	Data items	#12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such
9			as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data
10			assumptions and simplifications
11			
12			
13	Outcomes and	#13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought,
14	prioritization		including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with
15			rationale
16			
17			
18	Risk of bias in	#14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of
19	individual studies		individual studies, including whether this will be done at the
20			outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will
21			be used in data synthesis
22			
23			
24			
25	Data synthesis	#15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively
26			synthesised
27			
28			
29	Data synthesis	#15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe
30			planned summary measures, methods of handling data and
31			methods of combining data from studies, including any planned
32			exploration of consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)
33			
34			
35			
36	Data synthesis	#15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity
37			or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)
38			
39			
40	Data synthesis	#15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of
41			summary planned
42			
43	Meta-bias(es)	#16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as
44			publication bias across studies, selective reporting within
45			studies)
46			
47			
48			
49	Confidence in	#17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be
50	cumulative		assessed (such as GRADE)
51	evidence		
52			
53			
54	Notes:		
55			
56			
57	•		10: Supplementary file 1 The PRISMA-P elaboration and explanation paper is distributed under the terms
58			of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 09. March 2022
59			
60			

using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with [Penelope.ai](#)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Self-efficacy instruments for individuals with coronary artery disease: a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062794.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Jun-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Almeida, Jose Alexandre; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Florêncio, Rêncio; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Lemos, Darllane; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Leite, Jéssica; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Physical Therapy Graduate Program Monteiro, Karolinne; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Peroni Gualdi, Lucien; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program
Primary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication
Keywords:	CARDIOLOGY, Coronary heart disease < CARDIOLOGY, Ischaemic heart disease < CARDIOLOGY, Myocardial infarction < CARDIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title:** Self-efficacy instruments for individuals with coronary artery disease: a
4 systematic review protocol.
5
6

7 **Authors:** José Alexandre Barbosa de Almeida¹, Rêncio Bento Florêncio¹, Darllane
8 Azevedo Lemos¹, Jéssica Costa Leite², Karolinne Souza Monteiro³, Lucien Peroni
9 Gualdi³.
10
11

12 **Affiliation:** ¹ Master students, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program, Federal
13 University of Rio Grande do Norte, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil;² Ph.D. Physical Therapy
14 Graduate Program, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, RN – Brazil; ³
15 Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate
16 Program, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil.
17
18
19

20 **Corresponding author:** Lucien Peroni Gualdi – Programa de Pós Graduação em
21 Ciências da Reabilitação, Faculdade de Ciências da Saúde do Trairi, Rua Vila do Trairi
22 S/N, CEP: 59200-000, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil. E-mail address:
23 lugualdi@hotmail.com, Telephone: +55(84) 99480 6888.
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Word count:** 1.217.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Self-efficacy is associated with management of diseases, psychological well-being, improved quality of life, and rehabilitation adherence. Several instruments related to behavior or specific disease (e.g., coronary artery disease [CAD]) assess self-efficacy. The evaluation of cardiac self-efficacy in individuals with CAD will support healthcare professionals to improve self-efficacy in interventions; therefore, a suitable instrument is crucial. This systematic review aims to assess measurement properties, methodological quality, and content of outcome measures of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD.

Methods and analysis: The study will be developed according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P) and Consensus Norms for Selection of Health Measuring Instruments (COSMIN). Search strategy will be performed in the following databases: MEDLINE (ovid), Web of Science, EMBASE, and PsycINFO. Studies assessing measurement properties of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD and without language or date restrictions will be included. Two independent authors will be responsible for eligibility of studies. Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the COSMIN RoB Checklist, whereas the Classification of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Assessment (GRADE) will assess quality of each study. Another two authors will independently evaluate the content and link to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health.

Ethics and Dissemination: This study does not require ethics committee approval since it is based on previously published data. Evidence from this systematic review will be disseminated through publication in peer-reviewed journals and submitted to scientific conferences .

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021262613.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This systematic review protocol is designed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P) and the Consensus-based Standards for the Selection of Health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN).
- No language and date restrictions will be included to consider the maximum number of relevant studies.
- The protocol will allow peer review reducing the possibility of duplicates or bias.

- The study will not include studies of instruments that have self-efficacy in their construct (eg, self-management, self-care), limiting only to self-efficacy instruments for coronary patients.
- This protocol may be limited due to the lack of patients and public involvement.

INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is defined as the belief of individuals about their ability to organize and perform a certain activity. It consists of elements of awareness, planning, and motivation, which can reflect on self-responsibility throughout the disease process;[1] thus, it is important for health promotion and management of chronic diseases.[1-3] Moreover, self-efficacy is associated with psychological well-being, improved quality of life, and better rehabilitation adherence.[4,5]

Measurement instruments of self-efficacy can be general[6], for specific health conditions (e.g., feeding behavior, physical activity, and medication adherence),[7- 9] or specific diseases (e.g., asthma, stroke, and coronary artery disease [CAD]).[10-13] Although many scales and questionnaires are available for self-efficacy, literature lacks methodological rigor and choice of instrument for individuals in pulmonary, metabolic, and cardiovascular rehabilitation programs.

CAD is characterized as reduced coronary artery lumen due to atherosclerotic plaques and may lead to chest pain, pressure or tightness sensation at different degrees of exertion, and dyspnea.[14, 15] Conventional treatment implies cardiovascular rehabilitation and changes in daily habits. The admission of individuals to cardiovascular rehabilitation programs aims to delay and prevent complications and improve physical fitness through aerobic and strength training.[16]

Therefore, instruments assessing self-efficacy are needed to prevent complications and increase treatment adherence.[1, 3] In this context, the assessment of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD will support healthcare professionals in individual interventions and improve self-efficacy of patients. This systematic review aims to identify instruments developed to assess cardiac self-efficacy in individuals with CAD and evaluate methodological quality and measurement properties. We also aim to link the content of instruments to the International Classification of Functioning,

1
2
3 Disability, and Health (ICF). Based on this, the review will facilitate identifying
4 discrepancies in measurement instruments and guide further research.
5
6

7 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

8 **Study methods**

9
10
11
12
13 This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
14 Reviews and Meta-analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P)[17] and the Consensus-based
15 Standards for the Selection of Health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN).[18, 19]
16
17

18 **Protocol registration**

19
20
21
22 The protocol was registered in the international prospective register of systematic
23 reviews (PROSPERO registration number CRD42021262613). Relevant changes in the
24 systematic review will be documented in the PROSPERO and published in the final
25 study.
26
27

28 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

29
30
31
32 Studies on the development of assessment of measurement properties of cardiac self-
33 efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD will be included without language and
34 date restrictions. Clinical trials or validation studies using self-reported or proxy-
35 reported measurements and those published as abstracts. Moreover, studies of
36 instruments that have self-efficacy in their construct (eg, self-management, self-care)
37 will also be excluded, limiting to self-efficacy instruments for coronary patients.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Search strategy**

45
46
47 The search strategy will be conducted from inception to date in MEDLINE (ovid), Web
48 of Science, EMBASE and PsycINFO databases considering the following: (1) construct
49 of interest (cardiac self-efficacy); (2) target population (individuals with CAD); (3) type
50 of instrument (questionnaire or scale); and (4) measurement properties; the latter will be
51 assessed using search filters validated for measurement studies and already applied in
52 previous reviews. Additional searches for relevant studies will be manually performed
53 in reference lists of primary studies and review articles. Searches will be performed
54 again before final analysis to verify new studies. The Supplementary file 1 show the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 search strategies we developed for the databases search. The study will follow COSMIN
4 recommendations.[20]
5
6

7 **Screening and selection of studies**

8
9
10 An online survey will be imported into a Mendeley reference manager list
11 (<https://www.mendeley.com>). Duplicates will be deleted before selections, and the
12 reference list exported to the Rayyan Qatar Computing Research Institute systematic
13 review platform (<https://rayyan.qcri.org>).[21] The detailed selection process will be
14 presented in the PRISMA-P flowchart.
15
16
17
18

19 Two independent authors (JABA and DAL) will select studies using titles and abstracts,
20 conduct a complete reading of potentially eligible studies, and identify and record
21 reasons for excluding those ineligible. In the case of disagreement, a virtual meeting
22 will be held for discussion and consultation with a third reviewer (LPG).
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Data extraction**

29
30 Two authors (JABA and DAL) will extract data following the Cochrane Collaboration
31 and PRISMA guidelines. Other authors will independently review data to verify
32 inclusion and exclusion criteria. The extracted information will include first author, year
33 of publication, general characteristics of the instrument (construct, subscales, number of
34 items, and version), study design, sample size, characteristics of individuals (e.g., age,
35 sex, location, country, language, methods for selecting participants, and response rate),
36 and results of measurement properties (i.e., internal consistency, reliability,
37 measurement error, content validity [including face validity], construct validity
38 [subdivided into structural validity, hypothesis testing, and cross-cultural validity],
39 validity of criterion, responsiveness, and interpretability [not a measurement property,
40 but necessary to adapt a research instrument or clinical practice]).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Data quality**

51
52 Methodological quality of studies will be assessed by two independent authors (RBF
53 and JCL) using COSMIN RoB Checklist.[18, 19] This tool considers ten measurement
54 properties and contains nine boxes with 3 to 35 items. Each box assigns a
55 methodological quality score for instrument development: (1) content validity, (2)
56 structural validity, (3) internal consistency, (4) cross-cultural validity and measurement
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 invariance, (5) reliability, (6) measurement error, (7) criterion validity, (8) hypothesis
4 testing for construct validity, and (9) responsiveness. Each item has four response
5 options: inadequate, doubtful, adequate, and very good.[22] Disagreements will be
6 solved by a third author (KSM).
7
8
9

10 The content extracted from measurement instruments will be compared using the ICF
11 framework.[23–25] Two independent authors (JABA and RBF) will evaluate the
12 content and link items of questionnaires to ICF standards. After, a third author (JCL)
13 will review the content.
14
15
16
17

18 **Data synthesis**

19
20 A narrative synthesis of results will be provided. In the possibility of validation studies
21 of the same instrument for different populations, methodological and psychometric
22 properties quality of such studies will be addressed as a unique instrument but
23 discussing the particularity of each version. A combination of measurement properties
24 will determine the overall evidence of the instrument. Studies will be grouped according
25 to similarity in terms of language, instrument version, study population, and application
26 form.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Results will be evaluated in clusters or summarized against the criteria for good
35 measurement properties to determine whether they are sufficient (+), insufficient (-),
36 inconsistent (+/-), or indeterminate (?). Furthermore, a modified Classification of
37 Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and *Evaluation* (GRADE) will
38 determine study quality.[26, 27]
39
40
41
42

43
44 Afterward, instruments will be categorized and justified according to COSMIN
45 recommendations:[28] (A) instrument is recommended for use and results are reliable;
46 (B) when it may be recommended but requires further research to assess quality of these
47 instruments; and (C) instrument should not be recommended.
48
49
50

51 **Patient and public involvement**

52
53 No patient or public involvement.
54
55

56 **Ethics and Dissemination**

1
2
3 The study does not require ethics committee approval since it is based on published
4 data. Evidence from this systematic review will be disseminated through publication of
5 results in peer-reviewed journals and submitted to scientific conferences.
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 **Contributors:** Authors made substantial contributions to the study design, developed
13 inclusion criteria, and search strategies. JABA developed the protocol, RBF, DAL, JCL,
14 KSM, and LPG provided critical insights and reviewed the protocol. JABA registered
15 the protocol in the PROSPERO database. All authors read and approved the final
16 version of the protocol.
17
18
19

20
21 **Funding Statement:** The study will be financed by the Coordenação de
22 Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Brazil. JABA, DAL and
23 RBF received grant from CAPES by Finance Code 001.
24
25
26

27
28 **Competing interests:** None declared.
29

30
31 **Patients consent for publication:** Not applicable.
32

33
34 **Provenance and peer review:** Not commissioned, externally peer-reviewed.
35

36 **Open access:** This is an open-access article distributed by the Creative Commons
37 Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which allows distribution,
38 remix, adapt, build upon this study non-commercially, and license the derivative studies
39 on different terms. Original study must be cited, given appropriate credit, any changes
40 must be indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See
41 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.
42
43
44
45

46
47 **ORCID iDs:**
48

49 José Alexandre Barbosa de Almeida <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0876-6794>
50

51 Rêncio Bento Florêncio <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2853-7988>
52

53 Darllane Azevedo Lemos <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2020-3940>
54

55 Jéssica Costa Leite <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4726-9416>
56

57 Karolinne Souza Monteiro <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2254-8723>
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lucien Peroni Gualdi <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6907-7335>
4
5
6
7

8 REFERENCES

9

- 10
11 1 Bandura A. Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Educ Behav*
12 2004;31:143–64.doi:10.1177/1090198104263660.
13
14
15 2 Roest AM, Martens EJ, Denollet J, *et al*. Prognostic association of anxiety post
16 myocardial infarction with mortality and new cardiac events: A meta-analysis.
17 *Psychosom Med* 2010;72:563–9 doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181dbff97
18
19 3 Bandura, A. Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran, *Encyclopedia of human*
20 *behavior*. New York: Academic Press. 1994.
21
22 4 Joeques K, Van Elderen T, Schreurs K. Self-efficacy and overprotection are
23 related to quality of life, psychological well-being and self-management in cardiac
24 patients. *J Health Psychol* 2007;12:4–16. doi:10.1177/1359105306069096.
25
26 5 Katch H. The role of self-efficacy in cardiovascular disease self-management: a
27 review of effective programs. *Patient Intell* 2010;2:33-44.doi:10.2147/PI.S12624
28
29 6 Luszczynska A, Scholz U, Schwarzer R. The general self-efficacy scale:
30 Multicultural validation studies. *J Psychol* 2005;139:439-
31 57.doi:10.3200/JRLP.139.5.439-457.
32
33 7 Birkett NJ, Hotz SB. A self-efficacy scale for heart-healthy eating. *Can J Public*
34 *Health* 1994;85:201-4. PMID: 7922967.
35
36 8 Wong EML, Leung DYP, Sit JWH, *et al*. Prospective Validation of the Chinese
37 Version of the Self-Efficacy for Exercise Scale among Middle-Aged Patients with
38 Coronary Heart Disease. *Rehabil Nurs* 2020;45:74–
39 9.doi:10.1097/RNJ.0000000000000156.
40
41 9 Saffari M, Zeidi IM, Fridlund B, *et al*. A Persian Adaptation of Medication
42 Adherence Self-Efficacy Scale (MASSES) in Hypertensive Patients: Psychometric
43 Properties and Factor Structure. *High Blood Press Cardiovasc Prev* 2015;22:247–
44 55.doi:10.1007/s40292-015-0101-8.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 10 Holley S, Knibb R, Latter S, *et al.* Development and validation of the
4 Adolescent Asthma Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (AASEQ). *Eur Respir J* 2019;54:1–
5 10.doi:10.1183/13993003.01375-2018.
6
7
8
9 11 Topçu S, Oguz S. Translation and validation study for the stroke self - efficacy
10 questionnaire in stroke survivors. *Int J Nurs Pract* 2018;24:1–8.doi:10.1111/ijn.12646.
11
12
13 12 Sullivan MD, Lacroix AZ, Russo J, *et al.* Self-efficacy and self-reported
14 functional status in coronary heart disease: A six-month prospective study. *Psychosom*
15 *Med* 1998;60:473–8.doi:10.1097/00006842-199807000-00014.
16
17
18
19 20 Fors A, Ulin K, Cliffordson C, *et al.* The Cardiac Self-Efficacy Scale, a useful
21 tool with potential to evaluate person-centred care. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*
22 2015;14:536–43.doi:10.1177/1474515114548622.
23
24
25 26 Li H, Sun K, Zhao R, *et al.* Inflammatory biomarkers of coronary heart disease.
27 *Front Biosci (Schol Ed)* 2018;10:185–96.doi:10.2741/s508.
28
29
30 31 Cagle SD, Cooperstein N. Coronary Artery Disease: Diagnosis and
32 Management. *Prim Care* 2018;45:45–61.doi:10.1016/j.pop.2017.10.001
33
34
35 36 Carvalho T, Milani M, Ferraz AS, *et al.* Brazilian Cardiovascular Rehabilitation
37 Guideline – 2020. *Arq Bras Cardiol* 2020;114:943–87.doi:10.36660/abc.20200407.
38
39
40 41 Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic
42 review and meta-analysis protocols (prisma-p) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*
43 2015;349:1–25.doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647.
44
45
46 47 Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Patrick DL, *et al.* The COSMIN checklist for
48 assessing the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties of health
49 status measurement instruments: an international Delphi study. *Qual Life Res*
50 2010;19:539–49.doi:10.1007/s11136-010-9606-8.
51
52
53 54 Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Knol DL, *et al.* The COSMIN checklist for
55 evaluating the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties: a
56 clarification of its content. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2010;10:22.doi:10.1186/1471-
57 2288-10-22.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20 Terwee CB, Jansma EP, Riphagen II, *et al.* Development of a methodological
4 PubMed search filter for finding studies on measurement properties of measurement
5 instruments. *Qual Life Res* 2009;18:1115–23.doi:10.1007/s11136-009-9528-5.
6
7
8
9 21 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al.* Rayyan-a web and mobile app
10 for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5:1–10.doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
11
12
13 22 Mokkink LB, de Vet HCW, Prinsen CAC, *et al.* COSMIN Risk of Bias checklist
14 for systematic reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures. *Qual Life Res*.
15 2018;27:1171-9.doi:10.1007/s11136-017-1765-4.
16
17
18
19 23 Cieza A, Geyh S, Chatterji S, *et al.* ICF linking rules: An update based on
20 lessons learned. *J Rehabil Med* 2005;37:212–8.doi:10.1080/16501970510040263.
21
22
23 24 Cieza A, Brockow T, Ewert T, *et al.* Linking health-status measurements to the
24 International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *J Rehabil Med*
25 2002;34:205–10.doi:10.1080/165019702760279189.
26
27
28
29 30 25 Castro SS, Castaneda L, de Araújo ES, *et al.* Aferição de funcionalidade em
31 inquéritos de saúde no Brasil: Discussão sobre instrumentos baseados na Classificação
32 Internacional de Funcionalidade, Incapacidade e Saúde (CIF). *Rev Bras Epidemiol*
33 2016;19:679–87.doi:10.1590/1980-5497201600030018.
34
35
36
37 38 26 Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman AD, *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 14. Going from
39 evidence to recommendations: The significance and presentation of recommendations. *J*
40 *Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66:719–25.doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.03.013.
41
42
43 44 27 Andrews JC, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 15. Going
45 from evidence to recommendation - Determinants of a recommendation's direction and
46 strength. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66:726–35.doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.02.003.
47
48
49 50 28 Mokkink LB, Prinsen CAC, Patrick DL, *et al.* COSMIN methodology for
51 systematic reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) - user manual
52 Netherlands: COSMIN, 2018. Available:[https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-](https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf)
53 [content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-](https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf)
54 [1.pdf](https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf).pdf [Accessed 20 Dez 2021].
55
56
57
58
59
60

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1**Search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid)**

1. exp Self Efficacy/
2. self-efficacy.mp.
3. 1 or 2
4. exp Coronary Artery Disease/
5. Coronary Artery Disease.mp.
6. coronary heart disease.mp.
7. exp Coronary Disease/
8. exp Acute Coronary Syndrome/
9. Heart disease.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
10. exp heart diseases/
11. exp myocardial ischemia/
12. exp Cardiovascular Diseases/
13. Cardiovascular Disease.mp.
14. exp Heart Failure/
15. heart failure.mp.
16. 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15
17. instrument*.mp.
18. instruments*.mp.
19. measure*.mp.
20. measures*.mp.
21. questionnaire*.mp.
22. exp "Surveys and Questionnaires"/
23. questionnaires*.mp.
24. scale*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
25. scales*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
26. tool*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
27. tools*.mp.
28. survey*.mp.
29. test*.mp.
30. 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29
31. 3 and 16 and 30
32. (instrumentation or methods).fs.
33. (Validation Studies or Comparative Study).pt.

- 1
- 2
- 3 34. exp Psychometrics/
- 4 35. psychometr*.ti,ab.
- 5 36. (clinimetr* or clinometr*).tw.
- 6 37. outcome assessment.ti,ab.
- 7 38. outcome measure*.tw.
- 8 39. exp Observer Variation/
- 9 40. observer variation.ti,ab.
- 10 41. exp Health Status Indicators/
- 11 42. exp Reproducibility of Results/
- 12 43. reproducib*.ti,ab.
- 13 44. exp Discriminant Analysis/
- 14 45. (reliab* or unreliab* or valid* or coefficient or homogeneity or homogeneous or
- 15 internal consistency).ti,ab.
- 16 46. (cronbach* and (alpha or alphas)).ti,ab.
- 17 47. (item and (correlation* or selection* or reduction*)).ti,ab.
- 18 48. (agreement or precision or imprecision or precise values or test-retest).ti,ab.
- 19 49. (test and retest).ti,ab.
- 20 50. (reliab* and (test or retest)).ti,ab.
- 21 51. ((replicab* or repeated) and (measure or measures or findings or result or results or
- 22 test or tests)).ti,ab.
- 23 52. (generaliza* or generalisa* or concordance).ti,ab.
- 24 53. (intraclass and correlation*).ti,ab.
- 25 54. (discriminative or known group or factor analysis or factor analyses or dimension*
- 26 or subscale*).ti,ab.
- 27 55. (multitrait and scaling and (analysis or analyses)).ti,ab.
- 28 56. (item discriminant or interscale correlation* or error or errors or individual
- 29 variability).ti,ab.
- 30 57. (variability and (analysis or values)).ti,ab.
- 31 58. (uncertainty and (measurement or measuring)).ti,ab.
- 32 59. (standard error of measurement or sensitiv* or responsive*).ti,ab.
- 33 60. ((minimal or minimally or clinical or clinically) and (important or significant or
- 34 detectable) and (change or difference)).ti,ab.
- 35 61. (small* and (real or detectable) and (change or difference)).ti,ab.
- 36 62. (meaningful change or ceiling effect or floor effect or Item response model or IRT
- 37 or Rasch or Differential item functioning or DIF or computer adaptive testing or item
- 38 bank or cross-cultural equivalence).ti,ab.
- 39 63. exp Reproducibility of Results/
- 40 64. cross-cultural equivalence.ti,ab.
- 41 65. development.ti,ab.
- 42 66. 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 or 44 or 45 or 46
- 43 or 47 or 48 or 49 or 50 or 51 or 52 or 53 or 54 or 55 or 56 or 57 or 58 or 59 or 60 or
- 44 61 or 62 or 63 or 64 or 65
- 45 67. 31 and 66
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Search strategy for Web of Science

<i>n</i>	Search terms
#1	Search: TS=(Self-Efficacy*) OR TS=(Self Efficacy*)
#2	Search: TS=(Coronary Artery Disease*) OR TS=(Coronary Disease*) OR TS=(Coronary Heart Disease*) OR TS=(Acute Coronary Syndrome) OR TS=(Heart disease*) OR TS=(Cardiovascular disease*) OR TS=(Heart failure) OR TS=(Myocardial ischemia)
#3	Search: TS=(Instrument*) OR TS=(instruments*) OR TS=(measure*) OR TS=(measures*) OR TS=(questionnaire*) OR TS=(questionnaires*) OR TS=(scale*) OR TS=(scales*) OR TS=(tool*) OR TS=(tools*) OR TS=(survey*) OR TS=(test*)
#4	Search: TS=(instrumentation) OR TS=(methods) OR TS=(“validation stud*”) OR TS=(“comparative stud*”) OR TS=(psychometrics) OR TS=(psychometr*) OR ALL=(clinimetr*) OR ALL=(clinometr*) OR TS=(“outcome assessment”) OR TS=(“outcome measure”) OR TS=(“observer variation”) OR TS=(“observer variation”) OR TS=(“health status indicators”) OR TS=(“reproducib*”) OR TS=(“discriminant analysis”) OR TS=(reliab*) OR TS=(unreliab*) OR TS=(valid*) OR TS=(“coefficient of variation”) OR TS=(coefficient) OR TS=(homogeneity) OR TS=(homogeneous) OR TS=(“internal consistency”) OR ((TS=(alpha) OR TS=(alphas)) AND TS=(cronbach*)) OR ((TS=(correlation*) OR TS=(selection*) OR TS=(reduction*)) AND TS=(item)) OR TS=(agreement) OR TS=(precision) OR TS=(imprecision) OR TS=(precise values) OR TS=(test-retest) OR (TS=(test) AND TS=(retest)) OR ((TS=(test) OR TS=(retest)) AND TS=(reliab*)) OR TS=(stability) OR TS=(interrater) OR TS=(inter-rater) OR TS=(intrarater) OR TS=(intra-rater) OR TS=(intertester) OR TS=(inter-tester) OR TS=(intratester) OR TS=(intra-tester) OR TS=(interobserver) OR TS=(inter-observer) OR TS=(intraobserver) OR TS=(intra-observer) OR TS=(intertechician) OR TS=(inter-technician) OR TS=(intratechnician) OR TS=(intra-technician) OR TS=(interexaminer) OR TS=(inter-examiner) OR TS=(intraexaminer) OR TS=(intra-examiner) OR TS=(interassay) OR TS=(inter-assay) OR TS=(intraassay) OR TS=(intra-assay) OR TS=(interindividual) OR TS=(inter-individual) OR TS=(intraindividual) OR TS=(intra-individual) OR TS=(interparticipant) OR TS=(inter-participant) OR TS=(intraparticipant) OR TS=(intraparticipant) OR TS=(kappa) OR TS=(kappa’s) OR TS=(kappas) OR TS=(repeatab*) OR ((ALL=(replicab*) OR ALL=(repeated)) AND (ALL=(measure) OR ALL=(measures) OR ALL=(findings) OR ALL=(result) OR ALL=(results) OR ALL=(test) OR ALL=(tests))) OR TS=(generaliza*) OR TS=(generalisa*) OR TS=(concordance) OR (TS=(intraclass) AND TS=(correlation*)) OR TS=(discriminative) OR TS=(known group) OR TS=(“factor analysis”) OR TS=(“factor analyses”) OR TS=(“factor structure”) OR TS=(“factor structures”) OR TS=(dimension*) OR TS=(subscale*) OR ((TS=(analysis) OR TS=(analyses)) AND TS=(scaling) AND TS=(multitrait)) OR TS=(“item discriminant”) OR TS=(“interscale correlation*”) OR TS=(error) OR TS=(errors) OR TS=(“individual variability”) OR TS=(“interval variability”) OR TS=(“rate variability”) OR ((TS=(values) OR TS=(analysis)) AND TS=(variability)) OR ((TS=(measurement) OR TS=(measuring)) AND TS=(uncertainty)) OR TS=(“standard error of measurement”) OR TS=(sensitiv*) OR TS=(responsive*) OR (TS=(limit) AND TS=(detection)) OR TS=(“minimal detectable concentration”) OR TS=(interpretab*) OR ((TS=(minimal) OR TS=(minimally) OR TS=(clinical) OR TS=(clinically)) AND (TS=(important) OR TS=(significant) OR TS=(detectable)) AND (TS=(change) OR TS=(difference))) OR (TS=(small) AND (TS=(real) OR TS=(detectable)) AND (TS=(change) OR TS=(difference))) OR TS=(“meaningful change”) OR TS=(“ceiling effect”) OR TS=(“floor effect”) OR TS=(“Item response model”) OR TS=(IRT) OR TS=(Rasch) OR TS=(“differential item functioning”) OR TS=(DIF) OR TS=(“computer adaptive testing”) OR TS=(“item bank”) OR TS=(“cross-cultural equivalence”) OR TS=(“development”)
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Search strategy for Embase and PsycINFO

<i>n</i>	Search terms
#1	("Self-Efficacy*" OR "Self Efficacy*")
#2	("Coronary Artery Disease*" OR "Coronary Disease*" OR "Coronary Heart Disease*" OR "Acute Coronary Syndrome" OR "Heart disease*" OR "Cardiovascular disease*" OR "Heart failure" OR "Myocardial ischemia")
#3	("Instrument*" OR "Instruments*" OR "measure*" OR "measures*" OR "questionnaire*" OR "questionnaires" OR "scale*" OR "scales*" OR "tool*" OR "tools*" OR "survey*" OR "test*")
#4	("instrumentation" OR "methods" OR "Validation Studies" OR "Comparative Study" OR "psychometrics" OR "psychometr*" OR "clinimetr*" OR "clinometr*" OR "outcome assessment (health care)" OR "outcome assessment" OR "outcome measure*" OR "observer variation" OR "observer variation" OR "Health Status Indicators" OR "reproducibility of results" OR "reproducib*" OR "discriminant analysis" OR "reliab*" OR "unreliab*" OR "valid*" OR "coefficient of variation" OR "coefficient" OR "homogeneity" OR "homogeneous" OR "internal consistency" OR ("cronbach*" AND "alpha" OR "alphas") OR ("item" AND ("correlation*" OR "selection*" OR "reduction*")) OR "agreement" OR "precision" OR "imprecision" OR "precise values" OR "test-retest" OR ("test" AND "retest") OR ("reliab*" AND ("test" OR "retest")) OR "stability" OR "interrater" OR "inter-rater" OR "intrarater" OR "intra-rater" OR "intertester" OR "inter-tester" OR "intratester" OR "intra-tester" OR "interobserver" OR "inter-observer" OR "intraobserver" OR "intra-observer" OR "intertechnician" OR "inter-technician" OR "intratechnician" OR "intra-technician" OR "interexaminer" OR "inter-examiner" OR "intraexaminer" OR "intra-examiner" OR "interassay" OR "inter-assay" OR "intraassay" OR "intra-assay" OR "interindividual" OR "inter-individual" OR "intraindividual" OR "intra-individual" OR "interparticipant" OR "inter-participant" OR "intraparticipant" OR "intra-participant" OR "kappa" OR "kappa's" OR "kappas" OR "repeatable*" OR (("replicab*" OR "repeated") AND ("measure" OR "measures" OR "findings" OR "result" OR "results" OR "test" OR "tests")) OR "generaliza*" OR "generalisa*" OR "concordance" OR ("intraclass" AND "correlation*") OR "discriminative" OR "known group" OR "factor analysis" OR "factor analyses" OR "factor structure" OR "factor structures" OR "dimension*" OR "subscale*" OR ("multitrait" AND "scaling" AND ("analysis" OR "analyses")) OR "item discriminant" OR "interscale correlation*" OR "error" OR "errors" OR "individual variability" OR "interval variability" OR "rate variability" OR ("variability" AND ("analysis" OR "values")) OR ("uncertainty" AND ("measurement" OR "measuring")) OR "standard error of measurement" OR "sensitiv*" OR "responsive*" OR ("limit" AND "detection") OR "minimal detectable concentration" OR "interpretab*" OR (("minimal" OR "minimally" OR "clinical" OR "clinically") AND ("important" OR "significant" OR "detectable") AND ("change" OR "difference")) OR ("small*" AND ("real" OR "detectable") AND ("change" OR "difference")) OR "meaningful change" OR "ceiling effect" OR "floor effect" OR "Item response model" OR "IRT" OR "Rasch" OR "Differential item functioning" OR "DIF" OR "computer adaptive testing" OR "item bank" OR "cross-cultural equivalence" OR "development")
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review and meta analysis.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-Reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Title			
Identification	#1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	#1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	1
Registration			
	#2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3
Authors			
Contact	#3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1, 10
Contribution	#3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	9

Amendments

#4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	n/a
--------------------	---	-----

Support

Sources	#5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	10
Sponsor	#5b	Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	n/a
Role of sponsor or funder	#5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	n/a

Introduction

Rationale	#6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	1,3
Objectives	#7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	3

Methods

Eligibility criteria	#8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	3
Information sources	#9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	4
Search strategy	#10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Supplementary file 1
Study records - data management	#11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	4,5
Study records - selection process	#11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review	4,5

(that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)

1				
2				
3	Study records -	#11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such	4
4	data collection		as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any	
5	process		processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	
6				
7				
8	Data items	#12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such	3-5
9			as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data	
10			assumptions and simplifications	
11				
12				
13	Outcomes and	#13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought,	3-5
14	prioritization		including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with	
15			rationale	
16				
17				
18	Risk of bias in	#14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of	6
19	individual studies		individual studies, including whether this will be done at the	
20			outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will	
21			be used in data synthesis	
22				
23				
24				
25	Data synthesis	#15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively	5
26			synthesised	
27				
28				
29	Data synthesis	#15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe	5
30			planned summary measures, methods of handling data and	
31			methods of combining data from studies, including any planned	
32			exploration of consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)	
33				
34				
35				
36	Data synthesis	#15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity	5
37			or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
38				
39				
40	Data synthesis	#15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of	5
41			summary planned	
42				
43	Meta-bias(es)	#16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as	5
44			publication bias across studies, selective reporting within	
45			studies)	
46				
47				
48				
49	Confidence in	#17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be	5
50	cumulative		assessed (such as GRADE)	
51	evidence			
52				
53				
54	Notes:			
55				
56				
57	•		10: Supplementary file 1 The PRISMA-P elaboration and explanation paper is distributed under the terms	
58			of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 09. March 2022	
59				
60				

1 using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with
2 [Penelope.ai](#)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Self-efficacy instruments for individuals with coronary artery disease: a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062794.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Jul-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Almeida, Jose Alexandre; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Florêncio, Rêncio; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Lemos, Darllane; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Leite, Jéssica; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Physical Therapy Graduate Program Monteiro, Karolinne; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program Peroni Gualdi, Lucien; Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program
Primary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication
Keywords:	CARDIOLOGY, Coronary heart disease < CARDIOLOGY, Ischaemic heart disease < CARDIOLOGY, Myocardial infarction < CARDIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Self-efficacy instruments for individuals with coronary artery disease: a systematic**
4 **review protocol**
5
6
7
8

9 José Alexandre Barbosa de Almeida¹, Rêncio Bento Florêncio¹, Darllane Azevedo
10 Lemos¹, Jéssica Costa Leite², Karolinne Souza Monteiro³, Lucien Peroni Gualdi³.
11
12
13
14

15 Affiliations: ¹ Master students, Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate Program, Federal
16 University of Rio Grande do Norte, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil;² Ph.D. Physical Therapy
17 Graduate Program, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, RN – Brazil; ³
18 Professor of department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences Graduate
19 Program, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Correspondence to:** Lucien Peroni Gualdi – Programa de Pós Graduação em Ciências
28 da Reabilitação, Faculdade de Ciências da Saúde do Trairi, Rua Vila do Trairi S/N,
29 CEP: 59200-000, Santa Cruz, RN – Brazil. E-mail address: lugualdi@hotmail.com
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Self-efficacy is associated with management of diseases, psychological well-being, improved quality of life, and rehabilitation adherence. Several instruments related to behavior or specific disease (e.g., coronary artery disease [CAD]) assess self-efficacy. The evaluation of cardiac self-efficacy in individuals with CAD will support healthcare professionals to improve self-efficacy via interventions; therefore, a suitable instrument is crucial. This systematic review aims to assess measurement properties, methodological quality, and content of outcome measures of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD.

Methods and analysis: The study has been developed according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P) and Consensus Norms for Selection of Health Measuring Instruments (COSMIN). The following databases will be searched: MEDLINE (ovid), Web of Science, EMBASE, and PsycINFO. Studies assessing measurement properties of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD will be included. No date or language restrictions will be applied to the search. Two independent authors will be responsible for assessing the eligibility of studies. Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the COSMIN RoB Checklist, and the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Assessment (GRADE) will be used to assess the quality of each study. Two authors will independently evaluate the content of instruments and link this to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health.

Ethics and dissemination: This study does not require ethics committee approval since it is based on previously published data. Evidence from this systematic review will be disseminated through publication in peer-reviewed journals and presentation at scientific conferences.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42021262613.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This systematic review protocol is designed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P) and the Consensus-based Standards for the Selection of Health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN).
- No language and date restrictions will be used, to include the maximum number of relevant studies.
- The publication of this protocol will ensure use of a preplanned methodology, helping to reduce the risk of biased reporting and avoid duplication of effort.

- The review will not include studies of instruments that have self-efficacy in their construct (eg, self-management, self-care), limiting only to self-efficacy instruments for coronary patients.
- This protocol may be limited by the lack of patient and public involvement in its development.

INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is defined as the belief of individuals about their ability to organize and perform a certain activity. It consists of elements of awareness, planning, and motivation, which can reflect on self-responsibility throughout the disease process;^[1] thus, it is important for health promotion and management of chronic diseases.^[1-3] Moreover, self-efficacy is associated with psychological well-being, improved quality of life, and better rehabilitation adherence.^[4,5]

Measurement instruments of self-efficacy can be general^[6], for specific health conditions (e.g., feeding behavior, physical activity, and medication adherence),^[7- 9] or specific diseases (e.g., asthma, stroke, and coronary artery disease [CAD]).^[10-13] Although many scales and questionnaires are available for self-efficacy, literature lacks methodological rigor and choice of instrument for individuals in pulmonary, metabolic, and cardiovascular rehabilitation programs.

CAD is characterized as reduced coronary artery lumen due to atherosclerotic plaques and may lead to chest pain, pressure or tightness sensation at different degrees of exertion, and dyspnea.^[14, 15] Conventional treatment implies cardiovascular rehabilitation and changes in daily habits. The admission of individuals to cardiovascular rehabilitation programs aims to delay and prevent complications and improve physical fitness through aerobic and strength training.^[16]

Therefore, instruments assessing self-efficacy are needed to prevent complications and increase treatment adherence.^[1, 3] In this context, the assessment of cardiac self-efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD will support healthcare professionals in individual interventions and improve self-efficacy of patients. This systematic review aims to identify instruments developed to assess cardiac self-efficacy in individuals with CAD and evaluate methodological quality and measurement properties. We also aim to link the content of instruments to the International Classification of Functioning,

1
2
3 Disability, and Health (ICF). Based on this, the review will facilitate identifying
4 discrepancies in measurement instruments and guide further research.
5
6

7 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

8 **Study design and registration**

9
10
11
12
13 This protocol was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
14 Reviews and Meta-analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P)[17] and the Consensus-based
15 Standards for the Selection of Health Measurement Instruments (COSMIN).[18, 19]
16
17 The protocol was registered in the international prospective register of systematic
18 reviews (PROSPERO registration number CRD42021262613). Relevant changes in the
19
20 systematic review will be documented in the PROSPERO and published in the final
21
22 study report.
23
24
25

26 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

27
28
29 Studies on the development of assessment of measurement properties of cardiac self-
30 efficacy instruments for individuals with CAD will be included without language and
31
32 date restrictions. Translation of other languages will be performed by language experts.
33
34 Clinical trials or validation studies using self-reported or proxy-reported measurements
35
36 and those published as abstracts will be excluded. Moreover, studies of instruments that
37
38 have self-efficacy in their construct (eg, self-management, self-care) will also be
39
40 excluded, limiting to self-efficacy instruments for coronary patients.
41

42 **Search strategy**

43
44
45 The search strategy will be conducted from database inception to the date of the final
46 searches in MEDLINE (ovid), Web of Science, EMBASE and PsycINFO databases
47
48 considering the following: (1) construct of interest (cardiac self-efficacy); (2) target
49
50 population (individuals with CAD); (3) type of instrument (questionnaire or scale); and
51
52 (4) measurement properties; the latter will be assessed using search filters validated for
53
54 measurement studies and already applied in previous reviews. Additional searches for
55
56 relevant studies will be manually performed in reference lists of primary studies and
57
58 review articles. Searches will be repeated before the final analysis to check for new
59
60 studies. Supplementary file 1 show the search strategies we developed for the databases
search. The study will follow COSMIN recommendations.[20]

Screening and selection of studies

The search results will be imported into the reference list management tool Mendeley (<https://www.mendeley.com>). Duplicates will be deleted before selections, and the reference list exported to the Rayyan Qatar Computing Research Institute systematic review platform (<https://rayyan.qcri.org>).^[21] The detailed selection process will be presented in the PRISMA-P flowchart.

Two independent authors (JABA and DAL) will select studies using titles and abstracts, conduct a complete reading of potentially eligible studies, and identify and record reasons for excluding those ineligible. In the case of disagreement, a virtual meeting will be held for discussion and consultation with a third reviewer (LPG).

Data extraction

Two authors (JABA and DAL) will extract data following the Cochrane Collaboration and PRISMA guidelines. Other authors will independently review data to verify inclusion and exclusion criteria. The extracted information will include first author, year of publication, general characteristics of the instrument (construct, subscales, number of items, and version), study design, sample size, characteristics of individuals (e.g., age, sex, location, country, language, methods for selecting participants, and response rate), and results of measurement properties (i.e., internal consistency, reliability, measurement error, content validity [including face validity], construct validity [subdivided into structural validity, hypothesis testing, and cross-cultural validity], validity of criterion, responsiveness, and interpretability [not a measurement property, but necessary to adapt a research instrument or clinical practice]).

Data quality

Methodological quality of studies will be assessed by two independent authors (RBF and JCL) using COSMIN RoB Checklist.^[18, 19] This tool considers ten measurement properties and contains nine boxes with 3 to 35 items. Each box assigns a methodological quality score for instrument development: (1) content validity, (2) structural validity, (3) internal consistency, (4) cross-cultural validity and measurement invariance, (5) reliability, (6) measurement error, (7) criterion validity, (8) hypothesis testing for construct validity, and (9) responsiveness. Each item has four response

options: inadequate, doubtful, adequate, and very good.[22] Disagreements will be solved by a third author (KSM).

The content extracted from measurement instruments will be compared using the ICF framework.[23–25] Two independent authors (JABA and RBF) will evaluate the content and link items of questionnaires to ICF standards. After, a third author (JCL) will review the content.

Data synthesis

A narrative synthesis of results will be provided. In the possibility of validation studies of the same instrument for different populations, methodological and psychometric properties quality of such studies will be addressed as a unique instrument but discussing the particularity of each version. A combination of measurement properties will determine the overall evidence of the instrument. Studies will be grouped according to similarity in terms of language, instrument version, study population, and application form.

Results will be evaluated in clusters or summarized against the criteria for good measurement properties to determine whether they are sufficient (+), insufficient (-), inconsistent (+/-), or indeterminate (?). Furthermore, a modified Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) will determine study quality.[26, 27]

Afterward, instruments will be categorized and justified according to COSMIN recommendations:[28] (A) instrument is recommended for use and results are reliable; (B) when it may be recommended but requires further research to assess quality of these instruments; and (C) instrument should not be recommended.

Patient and public involvement

None.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

The study does not require ethics committee approval since it is based on published data. Evidence from this systematic review will be disseminated through publication of results in peer-reviewed journals and presentation at scientific conferences.

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Contributors:** Authors made substantial contributions to the study design, developed
7 inclusion criteria, and search strategies. JABA developed the protocol, RBF, DAL, JCL,
8 KSM, and LPG provided critical insights and reviewed the protocol. JABA registered
9 the protocol in the PROSPERO database. All authors read and approved the final
10 version of the protocol.
11
12
13

14
15 **Funding:** The study will be financed by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de
16 Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Brazil. JABA, DAL and RBF received grant from
17 CAPES by Finance Code 001.
18
19

20
21 **Competing interests:** None declared.
22

23
24 **Patients consent for publication:** Not applicable.
25

26
27 **Provenance and peer review:** Not commissioned, externally peer-reviewed.
28

29
30 **Open access:** This is an open-access article distributed by the Creative Commons
31 Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which allows distribution,
32 remix, adapt, build upon this study non-commercially, and license the derivative studies
33 on different terms. Original study must be cited, given appropriate credit, any changes
34 must be indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See
35 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.
36
37
38
39

40 41 **ORCID iDs:**

42
43 José Alexandre Barbosa de Almeida <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0876-6794>

44
45 Rêncio Bento Florêncio <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2853-7988>

46
47 Darllane Azevedo Lemos <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2020-3940>

48
49 Jéssica Costa Leite <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4726-9416>

50
51 Karolinne Souza Monteiro <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2254-8723>

52
53 Lucien Peroni Gualdi <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6907-7335>
54
55
56
57
58

59 **REFERENCES** 60

- 1 Bandura A. Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Educ Behav* 2004;31:143–64.doi:10.1177/1090198104263660.
- 2 Roest AM, Martens EJ, Denollet J, *et al.* Prognostic association of anxiety post myocardial infarction with mortality and new cardiac events: A meta-analysis. *Psychosom Med* 2010;72:563–9 doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181dbff97.
- 3 Bandura, A. Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran, *Encyclopedia of human behavior*. New York: Academic Press. 1994.
- 4 Joeke K, Van Elderen T, Schreurs K. Self-efficacy and overprotection are related to quality of life, psychological well-being and self-management in cardiac patients. *J Health Psychol* 2007;12:4–16. doi:10.1177/1359105306069096.
- 5 Katch H. The role of self-efficacy in cardiovascular disease self-management: a review of effective programs. *Patient Intell* 2010;2:33-44.doi:10.2147/PL.S12624.
- 6 Luszczynska A, Scholz U, Schwarzer R. The general self-efficacy scale: Multicultural validation studies. *J Psychol* 2005;139:439-57.doi:10.3200/JRLP.139.5.439-457.
- 7 Birkett NJ, Hotz SB. A self-efficacy scale for heart-healthy eating. *Can J Public Health* 1994;85:201-4. PMID: 7922967.
- 8 Wong EML, Leung DYP, Sit JWH, *et al.* Prospective Validation of the Chinese Version of the Self-Efficacy for Exercise Scale among Middle-Aged Patients with Coronary Heart Disease. *Rehabil Nurs* 2020;45:74–9.doi:10.1097/RNJ.000000000000156.
- 9 Saffari M, Zeidi IM, Fridlund B, *et al.* A Persian Adaptation of Medication Adherence Self-Efficacy Scale (MASSES) in Hypertensive Patients: Psychometric Properties and Factor Structure. *High Blood Press Cardiovasc Prev* 2015;22:247–55.doi:10.1007/s40292-015-0101-8.
- 10 Holley S, Knibb R, Latter S, *et al.* Development and validation of the Adolescent Asthma Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (AASEQ). *Eur Respir J* 2019;54:1–10.doi:10.1183/13993003.01375-2018.

- 1
2
3 11 Topçu S, Oguz S. Translation and validation study for the stroke self - efficacy
4 questionnaire in stroke survivors. *Int J Nurs Pract* 2018;24:1–8.doi:10.1111/ijn.12646.
5
6
7 12 Sullivan MD, Lacroix AZ, Russo J, *et al.* Self-efficacy and self-reported
8 functional status in coronary heart disease: A six-month prospective study. *Psychosom*
9 *Med* 1998;60:473–8.doi:10.1097/00006842-199807000-00014.
10
11
12
13 13 Fors A, Ulin K, Cliffordson C, *et al.* The Cardiac Self-Efficacy Scale, a useful
14 tool with potential to evaluate person-centred care. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*
15 2015;14:536–43.doi:10.1177/1474515114548622.
16
17
18
19 14 Li H, Sun K, Zhao R, *et al.* Inflammatory biomarkers of coronary heart disease.
20 *Front Biosci (Schol Ed)* 2018;10:185–96.doi:10.2741/s508.
21
22
23
24 15 Cagle SD, Cooperstein N. Coronary Artery Disease: Diagnosis and
25 Management. *Prim Care* 2018;45:45–61.doi:10.1016/j.pop.2017.10.001.
26
27
28
29 16 Carvalho T, Milani M, Ferraz AS, *et al.* Brazilian Cardiovascular Rehabilitation
30 Guideline – 2020. *Arq Bras Cardiol* 2020;114:943–87.doi:10.36660/abc.20200407.
31
32
33 17 Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic
34 review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: Elaboration and explanation.
35 *BMJ* 2015;349:1–25.doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647.
36
37
38
39 18 Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Patrick DL, *et al.* The COSMIN checklist for
40 assessing the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties of health
41 status measurement instruments: an international Delphi study. *Qual Life Res*
42 2010;19:539–49.doi:10.1007/s11136-010-9606-8.
43
44
45
46
47 19 Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Knol DL, *et al.* The COSMIN checklist for
48 evaluating the methodological quality of studies on measurement properties: a
49 clarification of its content. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2010;10:22.doi:10.1186/1471-
50 2288-10-22.
51
52
53
54
55 20 Terwee CB, Jansma EP, Riphagen II, *et al.* Development of a methodological
56 PubMed search filter for finding studies on measurement properties of measurement
57 instruments. *Qual Life Res* 2009;18:1115–23.doi:10.1007/s11136-009-9528-5.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 21 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al.* Rayyan-a web and mobile app
4 for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5:1–10.doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
5
6
7 22 Mokkink LB, de Vet HCW, Prinsen CAC, *et al.* COSMIN Risk of Bias checklist
8 for systematic reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures. *Qual Life Res.*
9 2018;27:1171-9.doi:10.1007/s11136-017-1765-4.
10
11
12
13 23 Cieza A, Geyh S, Chatterji S, *et al.* ICF linking rules: An update based on
14 lessons learned. *J Rehabil Med* 2005;37:212–8.doi:10.1080/16501970510040263.
15
16
17
18 24 Cieza A, Brockow T, Ewert T, *et al.* Linking health-status measurements to the
19 International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *J Rehabil Med*
20 2002;34:205–10.doi:10.1080/165019702760279189.
21
22
23
24 25 Castro SS, Castaneda L, de Araújo ES, *et al.* Aferição de funcionalidade em
25 inquéritos de saúde no Brasil: Discussão sobre instrumentos baseados na Classificação
26 Internacional de Funcionalidade, Incapacidade e Saúde (CIF). *Rev Bras Epidemiol*
27 2016;19:679–87.doi:10.1590/1980-5497201600030018.
28
29
30
31
32 26 Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman AD, *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 14. Going from
33 evidence to recommendations: The significance and presentation of recommendations. *J*
34 *Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66:719–25.doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.03.013.
35
36
37
38 27 Andrews JC, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 15. Going
39 from evidence to recommendation - Determinants of a recommendation's direction and
40 strength. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66:726–35.doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.02.003.
41
42
43
44 28 Mokkink LB, Prinsen CAC, Patrick DL, *et al.* COSMIN methodology for
45 systematic reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) - user manual
46 Netherlands: COSMIN, 2018. [https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-](https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf)
47 [syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf](https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018-1.pdf) [accessed 20 Dec 2021].
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1**Search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid)**

1. exp Self Efficacy/
2. self-efficacy.mp.
3. 1 or 2
4. exp Coronary Artery Disease/
5. Coronary Artery Disease.mp.
6. coronary heart disease.mp.
7. exp Coronary Disease/
8. exp Acute Coronary Syndrome/
9. Heart disease.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
10. exp heart diseases/
11. exp myocardial ischemia/
12. exp Cardiovascular Diseases/
13. Cardiovascular Disease.mp.
14. exp Heart Failure/
15. heart failure.mp.
16. 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15
17. instrument*.mp.
18. instruments*.mp.
19. measure*.mp.
20. measures*.mp.
21. questionnaire*.mp.
22. exp "Surveys and Questionnaires"/
23. questionnaires*.mp.
24. scale*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
25. scales*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
26. tool*.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
27. tools*.mp.
28. survey*.mp.
29. test*.mp.
30. 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29
31. 3 and 16 and 30
32. (instrumentation or methods).fs.
33. (Validation Studies or Comparative Study).pt.

- 1
- 2
- 3 34. exp Psychometrics/
- 4 35. psychometr*.ti,ab.
- 5 36. (clinimetr* or clinometr*).tw.
- 6 37. outcome assessment.ti,ab.
- 7 38. outcome measure*.tw.
- 8 39. exp Observer Variation/
- 9 40. observer variation.ti,ab.
- 10 41. exp Health Status Indicators/
- 11 42. exp Reproducibility of Results/
- 12 43. reproducib*.ti,ab.
- 13 44. exp Discriminant Analysis/
- 14 45. (reliab* or unreliab* or valid* or coefficient or homogeneity or homogeneous or
- 15 internal consistency).ti,ab.
- 16 46. (cronbach* and (alpha or alphas)).ti,ab.
- 17 47. (item and (correlation* or selection* or reduction*)).ti,ab.
- 18 48. (agreement or precision or imprecision or precise values or test-retest).ti,ab.
- 19 49. (test and retest).ti,ab.
- 20 50. (reliab* and (test or retest)).ti,ab.
- 21 51. ((replicab* or repeated) and (measure or measures or findings or result or results or
- 22 test or tests)).ti,ab.
- 23 52. (generaliza* or generalisa* or concordance).ti,ab.
- 24 53. (intraclass and correlation*).ti,ab.
- 25 54. (discriminative or known group or factor analysis or factor analyses or dimension*
- 26 or subscale*).ti,ab.
- 27 55. (multitrait and scaling and (analysis or analyses)).ti,ab.
- 28 56. (item discriminant or interscale correlation* or error or errors or individual
- 29 variability).ti,ab.
- 30 57. (variability and (analysis or values)).ti,ab.
- 31 58. (uncertainty and (measurement or measuring)).ti,ab.
- 32 59. (standard error of measurement or sensitiv* or responsive*).ti,ab.
- 33 60. ((minimal or minimally or clinical or clinically) and (important or significant or
- 34 detectable) and (change or difference)).ti,ab.
- 35 61. (small* and (real or detectable) and (change or difference)).ti,ab.
- 36 62. (meaningful change or ceiling effect or floor effect or Item response model or IRT
- 37 or Rasch or Differential item functioning or DIF or computer adaptive testing or item
- 38 bank or cross-cultural equivalence).ti,ab.
- 39 63. exp Reproducibility of Results/
- 40 64. cross-cultural equivalence.ti,ab.
- 41 65. development.ti,ab.
- 42 66. 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 or 44 or 45 or 46
- 43 or 47 or 48 or 49 or 50 or 51 or 52 or 53 or 54 or 55 or 56 or 57 or 58 or 59 or 60 or
- 44 61 or 62 or 63 or 64 or 65
- 45 67. 31 and 66
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Search strategy for Web of Science

<i>n</i>	Search terms
#1	Search: TS=(Self-Efficacy*) OR TS=(Self Efficacy*)
#2	Search: TS=(Coronary Artery Disease*) OR TS=(Coronary Disease*) OR TS=(Coronary Heart Disease*) OR TS=(Acute Coronary Syndrome) OR TS=(Heart disease*) OR TS=(Cardiovascular disease*) OR TS=(Heart failure) OR TS=(Myocardial ischemia)
#3	Search: TS=(Instrument*) OR TS=(instruments*) OR TS=(measure*) OR TS=(measures*) OR TS=(questionnaire*) OR TS=(questionnaires*) OR TS=(scale*) OR TS=(scales*) OR TS=(tool*) OR TS=(tools*) OR TS=(survey*) OR TS=(test*)
#4	Search: TS=(instrumentation) OR TS=(methods) OR TS=(“validation stud*”) OR TS=(“comparative stud*”) OR TS=(psychometrics) OR TS=(psychometr*) OR ALL=(clinimetr*) OR ALL=(clinometr*) OR TS=(“outcome assessment”) OR TS=(“outcome measure”) OR TS=(“observer variation”) OR TS=(“observer variation”) OR TS=(“health status indicators”) OR TS=(“reproducib*”) OR TS=(“discriminant analysis”) OR TS=(reliab*) OR TS=(unreliab*) OR TS=(valid*) OR TS=(“coefficient of variation”) OR TS=(coefficient) OR TS=(homogeneity) OR TS=(homogeneous) OR TS=(“internal consistency”) OR ((TS=(alpha) OR TS=(alphas)) AND TS=(cronbach*)) OR ((TS=(correlation*) OR TS=(selection*) OR TS=(reduction*)) AND TS=(item)) OR TS=(agreement) OR TS=(precision) OR TS=(imprecision) OR TS=(precise values) OR TS=(test-retest) OR (TS=(test) AND TS=(retest)) OR ((TS=(test) OR TS=(retest)) AND TS=(reliab*)) OR TS=(stability) OR TS=(interrater) OR TS=(inter-rater) OR TS=(intrarater) OR TS=(intra-rater) OR TS=(intertester) OR TS=(inter-tester) OR TS=(intratester) OR TS=(intra-tester) OR TS=(interobserver) OR TS=(inter-observer) OR TS=(intraobserver) OR TS=(intra-observer) OR TS=(intertechician) OR TS=(inter-technician) OR TS=(intratechnician) OR TS=(intra-technician) OR TS=(interexaminer) OR TS=(inter-examiner) OR TS=(intraexaminer) OR TS=(intra-examiner) OR TS=(interassay) OR TS=(inter-assay) OR TS=(intraassay) OR TS=(intra-assay) OR TS=(interindividual) OR TS=(inter-individual) OR TS=(intraindividual) OR TS=(intra-individual) OR TS=(interparticipant) OR TS=(inter-participant) OR TS=(intraparticipant) OR TS=(intraparticipant) OR TS=(kappa) OR TS=(kappa’s) OR TS=(kappas) OR TS=(repeatab*) OR ((ALL=(replicab*) OR ALL=(repeated)) AND (ALL=(measure) OR ALL=(measures) OR ALL=(findings) OR ALL=(result) OR ALL=(results) OR ALL=(test) OR ALL=(tests))) OR TS=(generaliza*) OR TS=(generalisa*) OR TS=(concordance) OR (TS=(intraclass) AND TS=(correlation*)) OR TS=(discriminative) OR TS=(known group) OR TS=(“factor analysis”) OR TS=(“factor analyses”) OR TS=(“factor structure”) OR TS=(“factor structures”) OR TS=(dimension*) OR TS=(subscale*) OR ((TS=(analysis) OR TS=(analyses)) AND TS=(scaling) AND TS=(multitrait)) OR TS=(“item discriminant”) OR TS=(“interscale correlation*”) OR TS=(error) OR TS=(errors) OR TS=(“individual variability”) OR TS=(“interval variability”) OR TS=(“rate variability”) OR ((TS=(values) OR TS=(analysis)) AND TS=(variability)) OR ((TS=(measurement) OR TS=(measuring)) AND TS=(uncertainty)) OR TS=(“standard error of measurement”) OR TS=(sensitiv*) OR TS=(responsive*) OR (TS=(limit) AND TS=(detection)) OR TS=(“minimal detectable concentration”) OR TS=(interpretab*) OR ((TS=(minimal) OR TS=(minimally) OR TS=(clinical) OR TS=(clinically)) AND (TS=(important) OR TS=(significant) OR TS=(detectable)) AND (TS=(change) OR TS=(difference))) OR (TS=(small) AND (TS=(real) OR TS=(detectable)) AND (TS=(change) OR TS=(difference))) OR TS=(“meaningful change”) OR TS=(“ceiling effect”) OR TS=(“floor effect”) OR TS=(“Item response model”) OR TS=(IRT) OR TS=(Rasch) OR TS=(“differential item functioning”) OR TS=(DIF) OR TS=(“computer adaptive testing”) OR TS=(“item bank”) OR TS=(“cross-cultural equivalence”) OR TS=(“development”)
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Search strategy for Embase and PsycINFO

<i>n</i>	Search terms
#1	("Self-Efficacy*" OR "Self Efficacy*")
#2	("Coronary Artery Disease*" OR "Coronary Disease*" OR "Coronary Heart Disease*" OR "Acute Coronary Syndrome" OR "Heart disease*" OR "Cardiovascular disease*" OR "Heart failure" OR "Myocardial ischemia")
#3	("Instrument*" OR "Instruments*" OR "measure*" OR "measures*" OR "questionnaire*" OR "questionnaires" OR "scale*" OR "scales*" OR "tool*" OR "tools*" OR "survey*" OR "test*")
#4	("instrumentation" OR "methods" OR "Validation Studies" OR "Comparative Study" OR "psychometrics" OR "psychometr*" OR "clinimetr*" OR "clinometr*" OR "outcome assessment (health care)" OR "outcome assessment" OR "outcome measure*" OR "observer variation" OR "observer variation" OR "Health Status Indicators" OR "reproducibility of results" OR "reproducib*" OR "discriminant analysis" OR "reliab*" OR "unreliab*" OR "valid*" OR "coefficient of variation" OR "coefficient" OR "homogeneity" OR "homogeneous" OR "internal consistency" OR ("cronbach*" AND "alpha" OR "alphas") OR ("item" AND ("correlation*" OR "selection*" OR "reduction*")) OR "agreement" OR "precision" OR "imprecision" OR "precise values" OR "test-retest" OR ("test" AND "retest") OR ("reliab*" AND ("test" OR "retest")) OR "stability" OR "interrater" OR "inter-rater" OR "intrarater" OR "intra-rater" OR "intertester" OR "inter-tester" OR "intratester" OR "intra-tester" OR "interobserver" OR "inter-observer" OR "intraobserver" OR "intra-observer" OR "intertechnician" OR "inter-technician" OR "intratechnician" OR "intra-technician" OR "interexaminer" OR "inter-examiner" OR "intraexaminer" OR "intra-examiner" OR "interassay" OR "inter-assay" OR "intraassay" OR "intra-assay" OR "interindividual" OR "inter-individual" OR "intraindividual" OR "intra-individual" OR "interparticipant" OR "inter-participant" OR "intraparticipant" OR "intra-participant" OR "kappa" OR "kappa's" OR "kappas" OR "repeatable*" OR (("replicab*" OR "repeated") AND ("measure" OR "measures" OR "findings" OR "result" OR "results" OR "test" OR "tests")) OR "generaliza*" OR "generalisa*" OR "concordance" OR ("intraclass" AND "correlation*") OR "discriminative" OR "known group" OR "factor analysis" OR "factor analyses" OR "factor structure" OR "factor structures" OR "dimension*" OR "subscale*" OR ("multitrait" AND "scaling" AND ("analysis" OR "analyses")) OR "item discriminant" OR "interscale correlation*" OR "error" OR "errors" OR "individual variability" OR "interval variability" OR "rate variability" OR ("variability" AND ("analysis" OR "values")) OR ("uncertainty" AND ("measurement" OR "measuring")) OR "standard error of measurement" OR "sensitiv*" OR "responsive*" OR ("limit" AND "detection") OR "minimal detectable concentration" OR "interpretab*" OR (("minimal" OR "minimally" OR "clinical" OR "clinically") AND ("important" OR "significant" OR "detectable") AND ("change" OR "difference")) OR ("small*" AND ("real" OR "detectable") AND ("change" OR "difference")) OR "meaningful change" OR "ceiling effect" OR "floor effect" OR "Item response model" OR "IRT" OR "Rasch" OR "Differential item functioning" OR "DIF" OR "computer adaptive testing" OR "item bank" OR "cross-cultural equivalence" OR "development")
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review and meta analysis.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-Reporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.

		Reporting Item	Page Number
Title			
Identification	#1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	#1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	1
Registration			
	#2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3
Authors			
Contact	#3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1, 10
Contribution	#3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	9

Amendments

#4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	n/a
--------------------	---	-----

Support

Sources	#5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	10
Sponsor	#5b	Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor	n/a
Role of sponsor or funder	#5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	n/a

Introduction

Rationale	#6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	1,3
Objectives	#7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	3

Methods

Eligibility criteria	#8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	3
Information sources	#9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	4
Search strategy	#10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Supplementary file 1
Study records - data management	#11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	4,5
Study records - selection process	#11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review	4,5

(that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)

1				
2				
3	Study records -	#11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such	4
4	data collection		as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any	
5	process		processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	
6				
7				
8	Data items	#12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such	3-5
9			as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data	
10			assumptions and simplifications	
11				
12				
13	Outcomes and	#13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought,	3-5
14	prioritization		including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with	
15			rationale	
16				
17				
18	Risk of bias in	#14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of	6
19	individual studies		individual studies, including whether this will be done at the	
20			outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will	
21			be used in data synthesis	
22				
23				
24				
25	Data synthesis	#15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively	5
26			synthesised	
27				
28				
29	Data synthesis	#15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe	5
30			planned summary measures, methods of handling data and	
31			methods of combining data from studies, including any planned	
32			exploration of consistency (such as I ² , Kendall's τ)	
33				
34				
35				
36	Data synthesis	#15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity	5
37			or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
38				
39				
40	Data synthesis	#15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of	5
41			summary planned	
42				
43	Meta-bias(es)	#16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as	5
44			publication bias across studies, selective reporting within	
45			studies)	
46				
47				
48				
49	Confidence in	#17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be	5
50	cumulative		assessed (such as GRADE)	
51	evidence			
52				
53				
54	Notes:			
55				
56				
57	•		10: Supplementary file 1 The PRISMA-P elaboration and explanation paper is distributed under the terms	
58			of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist was completed on 09. March 2022	
59				
60				

1 using <https://www.goodreports.org/>, a tool made by the [EQUATOR Network](#) in collaboration with
2 [Penelope.ai](#)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only