

Exploring the factor structure of the mini-ICF-APP in an inpatient clinical sample, according to the psychiatric diagnosis.

Authors:

Stephan T. Egger, MD^{1,2}
Godehard Weniger, MD¹
Julio Bobes, MD, PhD²
Erich Seifritz, MD¹
Stefan Vetter, MD¹

Affiliation:

¹ Centre for Integrative Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, Psychiatric University Hospital of Zurich, University of Zurich, Zurich-Switzerland.

² Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oviedo, CIBERSAM. Oviedo-Spain

Corresponding Author:

Stephan T. Egger, MD
Psychiatric University Hospital of Zurich, University of Zurich
Lenggstrasse 31
8032 Zurich
Switzerland

stephan.egger@puk.zh.ch

+41 52 304 9340

Word Count Abstract: 268 Words

Word Count Main Text: 2826 Words

Tables: 4

Figures: 1

Journal: Revista de Psiquiatría y Salud Mental

Abstract:

Introduction: Psychosocial functioning is a key factor determining prognosis, severity, impairment and quality of life in people who have a mental disorder. The mini-ICF-APP was developed to provide a standardised classification of functioning and disability. However, despite its gaining popularity little is known about its structure and performance. This paper examines the structure of the mini-ICF-APP using factor analysis techniques.

Materials and Methods: In a clinical sample of 3178 patients, with psychiatric diagnoses from several ICD-10 categories, we analysed internal consistency, item inter-correlations and the factorial structure of the data, with reference to ICD-10 diagnostic categories; Neurocognitive Disorders; Alcohol Use Disorders; Substance Use Disorders; Schizophrenia and Psychotic Disorders; Bipolar Disorder; Major Depressive Disorder; Anxiety Disorders; Personality Disorders; and Neurodevelopmental Disorders.

Results: We found good internal consistency and item inter-correlations (Cronbach alpha = 0.92) for the mini-ICF-APP. We were able to identify pivotal domains (flexibility, assertiveness and intimate relationships), which demonstrate sub-threshold influences on other domains. The factor analysis yielded a one-factor model as ideal for the whole sample and for all diagnostic categories. For some diagnostic categories the data suggested a two or three-factor model, however, with poorer fit indices.

Conclusions: The factor structure of the mini-ICF-APP appears to modify according to the main diagnosis. However, a one-factor model demonstrates better fit regardless of diagnostic category. Consequently, we consider the mini-ICF-APP to be a trans-diagnostic measurement instrument for the assessment and grading of psychosocial functioning. The use of the mini-ICF-APP sum score seems to best reflect the degree of impairment in an individual, even taking into account that affected domains may lead to sub-threshold effects on other domains.

Keywords: mini-ICF-APP, psychosocial functioning, mental health, psychiatric disorder, factor analysis, factor structure.

Introduction:

Psychiatric disorders are accompanied by limitations in psychosocial functioning and adjustment. Psychosocial functioning is a more important determinant for prognosis, severity, impairment and quality of life for those suffering from mental disorders than psychiatric diagnosis itself^{1,2}. Currently, psychiatric diagnoses rely principally on symptoms experienced and observed behaviour³⁻⁵. Despite the importance of psychosocial functioning, the correlation between diagnosis, symptom load and psychosocial impairment is weak^{6,7}. This has led to an ongoing discussion about the reliability and validity of psychiatric diagnosis in general and scales measuring symptomatology in particular^{5,8}. In order to close this gap, the WHO (World Health Organization) designed and developed the ICF (International Classification of Functioning), recognising psychosocial functioning as a key element for health and well-being^{8,9}.

The ICF focusses on the resources and potential of humans beings to engage in activities and participate in life, regardless of mental (or physical) condition⁹. Despite its importance, the ICF is not frequently used in day to day clinical practice; due mainly to the duration and complexity of the assessment^{5,6}. Several instruments have been developed in order to bridge this gap¹⁰; including the mini-ICF-APP^{11,12}. It is a 13-item scale, developed for the assessment of psychosocial functioning in people with mental health problems, regardless of diagnosis¹². It describes and classifies disorders of activity and capacity, which may lead to restrictions in social participation¹². Since its development publications, including the first publication, on the mini-ICF-APP have demonstrated it possesses good psychometric properties together with reliability and validity across the spectrum of psychiatric diagnoses¹³⁻¹⁷.

Since its development the mini-ICF-APP has been regularly implemented by health care providers, insurance companies and pension funds to assess disability and work impairment^{18,19}. It is one of the routine instruments used to determine access to services and financial support (e.g. disability pension)^{18,20}. Evaluation with the mini-ICF-APP should reflect the ability of an individual to function in their own personal and social context^{12,21}. The mini-ICF-APP can be interpreted at both item or sum score levels; with illness severity associated with more significant limitations in activity and capacity¹⁷. The use of the mini-ICF-APP sum-score should however be treated with caution since it cannot be considered a global incapacity index. Patients with limitations in pivotal dimensions may experience impairment due to the impact of these on other domains^{10,12}.

For a psychometric instrument to establish itself in clinical practice, and in particular as part of routine clinical assessment, its performance and interpretation must be known in advance. This can only be achieved through scientific scrutiny^{10,18}. Although the mini-ICF-APP shows good reliability and validity, several of its psychometric properties have not been thoroughly investigated¹⁰. The mini-ICF-APP sum score is frequently reported as an outcome, and does seem to relate to severity (i.e. incapacity), independent of psychiatric diagnosis^{17,21}. Therefore, we are interested in identifying whether individual items of the mini-ICF-APP show different performance patterns according to diagnosis, using an exploratory factor analysis, in order to describe its factorial structure according to the main ICD-10 diagnostic categories³.

Materials and Methods:

Measures

Clinical Global Impression Scales (CGI)

Severity was rated using the Clinical Global Impression Scales²². The CGI scale is a pragmatic, self-explanatory, assessment tool for psychiatric disorders. Due to its straightforward implementation and comprehensibility it is widely used in clinical practice and research²²⁻²⁷. The CGI consists of three subscales: 1. Severity of Illness (CGI-S), 2. Global Improvement (CGI-I), and 3. Efficacy Index (CGI-E)²². Both CGI-S and CGI-I are rated on a seven-point Likert scale; the CGI-S from “1” (healthy subject) to “7” (extremely ill subject); the CGI-I from “1” (significant improvement) to “7” (most severe deterioration), whereby a score of “4” indicates no change²². The CGI-S and CGI-E take into account the past week, whilst the CGI-I rating relates to the time elapsed since the first/previous CGI-S assessment.

Mini-ICF-APP

The mini-ICF-APP consists of thirteen items, each one evaluating ONE capacity or domain of functioning: (1) adherence to regulations and routines; (2) planning and structuring of tasks; (3) flexibility; (4) competency/efficacy; (5) endurance; (6) assertiveness; (7) contact with others; (8) group integration; (9) family and intimate relationships; (10) leisure activities; (11) self-care; (12) mobility; and (13) competence to judge and decide.

The evaluation of each item must take into account the patient's personal and social context¹². Comprehensible anchor-point definitions are provided for every item^{10,12}, which are rated on a five-point Likert-scale from 0 (no disability) to 4 (total disability). Items rated with either three or four are considered to merit/require clinical intervention^{4,12}. Correspondingly, we consider items rated three or more as clinically relevant (positive). The sum score of the mini-ICF-APP ranges from 0 to 52 points; with cut-off values defining severity: mild from 3 to 7 points; moderate from 8 to 15 points; marked from 16 to 24 points; severe 25 to 37; and extremely severe 38 or more points^{17,21}.

Sample and Procedure

The Centre for Integrative Psychiatry is part of the Psychiatric University Hospital of Zurich. It offers an integrative psychiatric and psychotherapeutic treatment programme for adult patients (aged 18 to 65 years) with a psychiatric disorder. As part of the routine clinical care and quality assessment patient and health-related data is collected; including the assessment of psychosocial functioning using the mini-ICF-APP. We analysed the mini-ICF-APP data from a five-year cohort of consecutive patients hospitalised for treatment (n=3295). Around four per cent (3.55%, n= 117) of the sample were excluded due to two or more missing items from the mini-ICF-APP. Patients excluded due to missing data did not differ from those with a complete data set regarding sex, age, education, civil status and main diagnosis. The final sample used for subsequent analyses comprised 3178 patients. The competent ethics committee approved the use of the data for further analysis and publication [KEK-ZH BASEC-Nr.: 2017-01766]. This data set was also used in a previous publication, although with a different aim and statistical analysis.¹²

Raters and Training

Raters were either psychiatrists, psychiatry residents or clinical psychologists. All raters received regular training in the use of the measurement instruments. The study instruments assess the seven days prior to admission. Ratings were conducted within the first 72 hours of hospitalisation. Ratings were based on information obtained from clinical interview and direct behavioural observations; together with information provided by nursing staff, social workers and others involved in the treatment process.

Diagnosis and Diagnostic Groups

Diagnoses were made by a psychiatry resident according to ICD-10 criteria³ and were confirmed or corrected by a senior psychiatrist. According to ICD-10 diagnostic categories we defined nine diagnostic groups²¹: NCD: Neurocognitive Disorders (ICD-10: F0); AUD: Alcohol Use Disorders (ICD-10: F10); SUD: Substance Use Disorders (ICD 10: F11-19); SPD: Schizophrenia and Psychotic Disorders (ICD-10: F2); BPD: Bipolar Disorder (ICD-10:F30-31); MDD: Major Depressive Disorder (ICD 10: F32-33); AXD: Anxiety Disorders (ICD-10: F4-F5); PD: Personality Disorders (ICD-10:F6); and NDD: Neurodevelopmental Disorders (ICD-10: F7-F9).

Statistical Analysis

The analysis included only participants with a complete data set at admission (one missing item on the mini-ICF-APP was acceptable). Simple descriptive statistics were used to represent the demographic and clinical characteristics of the sample; an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to analyse differences between diagnostic groups. We used multivariate regression to determine the correlation between demographic (i.e. gender, age, civil status, education) and clinical variables with main diagnosis, mini-ICF-APP sum score and CGI-S. The internal consistency of the mini-ICF-APP was assessed using Cronbach's alpha.

For item correlation we used the complete spectrum of severity for every item, as well as dichotomous variables. Therefore, each response item was transformed into a dichotomous variable according to clinical relevance; items rated three or four were considered positive, with values ranging from zero to two as negative^{11,12}. For the exploratory factor analysis (EFA), we chose to use only the dichotomous rating of the items in order to reduce multicollinearity and determine possible latent factors²⁸. The Principal Component Analysis (with a Varimax rotation method) determined the number of factors to be extracted, as well as determining dimensionality and factor structure.

An eigenvalue greater than one is a prerequisite for factor extraction. The Kaiser-Meier-Olkin (KMO) index was used to measure sampling adequacy. For the assessment and comparability of the fit of the possible models we used: Eigenvalues; Chi-Square, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI); the Root Mean Square Residual (RMSR); Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI). Cut-off values considered indicative for a good fit were: an Eigenvalue > 1 ; a Chi-square p value > 0.05 ; a CFI value ≤ 0.90 ; a RMSR value < 0.08 ; a RMSEA < 0.08 ; and a TLI ≥ 0.95 ^{29,30}.

All statistical analyses were conducted using the statistical software "R" (v3.6.1), for multivariate regression analysis we used the package "np" (v0.60-9); for analysis of the Likert scales we used the package "Likert" (v1.3.5), and for psychometric tests including the exploratory factor analysis we used the packages "psych" (v1.9.12) and "lavaan" (v0.6-5).

Results:

The sample included for analysis were aged between 16 and 77 years (43.50 ± 11.88) years; with 66.36% males. The majority of the sample was single, had completed an apprenticeship or college/university education. Patient admission was mostly voluntary (94.93%), with a mean length of stay of 41.49 ± 44.73 days; with a right skewed distribution. The CGI-S value for severity was 5.27 ± 0.91 . The total sum score of the mini-ICF-APP was 18.53 ± 10.34 , with a mean sum of positive items of 2.30 ± 3.08 with a right skewed distribution.

Gender distribution reached statistical significance for patients with AUD; this may be an artefact of the large sub-sample size. The shift in gender distribution for PD is also noteworthy although not clinically significant. Patients with SPD were more likely to have only completed primary school education (showed a higher proportion of primary education), reaching marginal significance. There were no further clinically significant differences between the diagnostic groups. For further details, see Table 1.

A general linear model found no statistically significant correlation between the mini-ICF-APP scores (sum score or total items with clinically relevant scores) and the main diagnosis, after correction for demographic parameters (age, gender, civil status, education). The correlation between the mini-ICF-APP sum score and the CGI-S score was statistically significant, for the whole sample and all diagnostic groups.

Table 1.

Item performance, Internal consistency, and Intercorrelation

The distribution of severity for each mini-ICF-APP item is shown in Figure 1. The internal consistency for the mini-ICF-APP ratings for the whole spectrum of severity yields a Cronbach's

alpha value of 0.93. The dichotomous mini-ICF-APP scale yields a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.87. Cronbach alpha values >0.80 indicate good levels of internal consistency; however, values >0.90 might indicate multicollinearity³¹. The higher Cronbach alpha value yield for items covering the whole spectrum of severity (i.e. from none to severe) suggested multicollinearity, which was confirmed when analysing the correlation between single items³¹.

Figure 1

The inter-correlation of the mini-ICF-APP items is shown in Table 2. In the upper half, the inter-correlation for the whole spectrum of severity (from none to severe); in the lower for clinically relevant items (i.e. items with a rating of three or four). We considered correlation indices >0.50 as relevant³². The inter-correlation of items was higher when using the whole spectrum of severity, as foreseen in the mini-ICF-APP manual¹².

Table 2

Exploratory Factor Analysis:

The KMO calculated was 0.92, supporting the adequacy of sampling for factor analysis. We calculated possible EFA models for the total sample and all diagnostic categories, based on the eigenvalues presented. In our opinion only eigenvalues greater than one are indicative of the presence of a meaningful model. For the total sample and for most diagnostic groups, a one or two-factor structure seems to be the preferred model. However, MDD, AXD and PD had values suggesting a three- or even four-factor model. Table 3 summarises the eigenvalues obtained together with fit indices for all possible models. Due to the large sample size Chi-square was positive for all models^{28,33}, therefore we consider this non-informative.

Table 3

We calculated the factor loadings for both one- and two-factor models, for the total sample and for each diagnostic category. Loadings >0.70 were considered relevant.¹⁷ The results are presented in Table 4. Overall, we found a robust loading for each item in the one-factor model; the distributions of items on the different factors in the two-factor model were not consistent across diagnostic groups as previously outlined (data not shown).

Table 4

Discussion:

The findings of our exploratory factor analysis of the mini-ICF-APP in a clinical population support the validity of the mini-ICF-APP for the assessment and categorisation of patients with a psychiatric disorder according to their level of functional impairment. Our results do not support the search for sub-factors relating to the functionality of patients with a given diagnosis. Furthermore, our results support the use of the scale as a whole for this purpose; confirming the usefulness of the sum-score for evaluation purposes.

The results we obtained are comparable to results from previous studies, yielding similar sum-scores for the mini-ICF-APP and similar severity gradings according to the CGI-S; moreover, values for internal consistency are identical^{13-16,34}. In contrast to previous publications examining the mini-ICF-APP, we were able to study a large clinical population. Furthermore, we included psychiatric disorders underrepresented in previous publications; including alcohol and substance use disorders; personality disorders and neurocognitive/neurodevelopmental disorders¹⁷. This allows for a broader interpretation of the results obtained.

In our exploratory factor analysis, the one-factor model showed the best-fit indices for all diagnostic groups as a whole as well as for each diagnostic group considered individually^{28,32,33}. For several diagnostic groups, a two- or three-factor model was suggested by the data; however, their fit indices were not consistently superior to the one-factor model^{28,33}, whilst having generally lower item-loadings for each possible factor (Table 4). Taking into account the parsimony criterion, we consider the one-factor model preferable^{29,30}.

Previous analyses of the factor structure of the mini-ICF-APP report two- and a three-factor solutions^{16,34}. Neither the factor structures nor the item distribution were replicated in our analysis. This may result from differences in sample size and diagnoses compared to previous studies^{16,28,34}. We see this corroborated in our analysis, as different factor structures and item loadings were generated for different diagnostic categories.

The analysis of the loadings and inter-correlation of the different items of the mini-ICF-APP, showed that certain items hold a pivotal position. The rating of “flexibility” (Item 3), “assertiveness” (Item 6) and “intimate relationships” (Item 9) yield a high correlation with the remaining items (particularly when the whole spectrum of severity is considered). Furthermore, these items hold high loading values across diagnostic categories. We consider this finding unsurprising since these elements are important for coping with challenges in life and adapting to circumstances as well as overcoming adversity^{35,36}.

Although our sample size was large, some diagnostic categories (NCD, BPD, AXD and NDD) were underrepresented (<130, ratio 1:10) which is suboptimal for factor analysis³². Therefore, the analysis conducted for these diagnostic categories should be interpreted with caution, the data is however included for the sake of completeness. Furthermore, several diagnostic categories used (i.e. NCD, PD and NDD) include an extremely heterogeneous group of diagnoses. This may explain the lack of difference in age for those with a neurocognitive disorder (NCD), since the group includes not only patients with a form of Dementia (ICD-10: F00 to F03) but also with other organic brain disorders (e.g. Delirium-ICD-10: F05).

Our analysis has confirmed the development and design of the mini-ICF-APP^{11,12}, as an instrument for measuring psychosocial functioning in patients suffering from a psychological disorder. Furthermore, although patterns of functioning, (i.e. impairment) vary across the different psychiatric diagnoses, some pivotal domains remain constant. In accordance with our results, we consider the mini-ICF-APP to be a universally applicable tool for the assessment and grading of psychosocial functioning.

When interpreting our results, it must be taken into account that the study data was collected from patients requiring hospitalisation for treatment; a higher symptom load is likely which may influence certain domains of psychosocial functioning, particularly at the time of admission³⁷⁻⁴⁰. The distinct influence of symptoms on psychosocial functioning could be accountable for the latent factor structure found for the different diagnostic groups. We consider the use of the sum-

score an easy and intuitively understood method; taking into account that symptoms as well as psychosocial functioning domains seem to have a sub-threshold impact on others¹⁷; consequently, increasing the total degree of impairment. In conclusion, we would encourage the use of the mini-ICF-APP to determine levels of psychosocial impairment in people suffering from a mental disorder in order to shape therapy accordingly, with a view to reestablishing the ability to cope with life and overcome adversity⁴¹.

Conclusions:

The mini-ICF-APP is an assessment and rating tool to assess psychosocial functioning, in people with a mental disorder regardless of psychiatric diagnosis. We identified a one-factor model, including all items, as the one with the best-fit values, irrespective of diagnostic category. Accordingly, we consider the mini-ICF-APP as a trans-diagnostic measurement instrument for the evaluation of all aspects of psychosocial functioning. The use of the mini-ICF-APP sum score seems to reflect the degree of impairment suffered by an individual, even taking into account that pivotal domains may lead to sub-threshold effects on others.

Acknowledgements

Lorna McBroom: for proofreading and language editing.

References:

1. Kapur RL, Chandrashekar CR, Kapur M, Kaliaperumal VG. Social dysfunctioning as a measure of severity of psychiatric illness. *Indian journal of psychiatry* 1981;23:27-32.
2. Cuthbert B, Insel T. The data of diagnosis: new approaches to psychiatric classification. *Psychiatry* 2010;73:311-4.
3. WHO. The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders: clinical descriptions and diagnostic guidelines. Geneva: World Health Organization 1992.
4. Association AP. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®): American Psychiatric Pub; 2013.
5. Insel TR, Cuthbert BN. Brain disorders? Precisely. *Science* 2015;348:499-500.
6. Linden M. [Disease and disability. The ICF model]. *Nervenarzt* 2015;86:29-35.
7. Linden M. What is health and what is positive? The ICF solution. *World Psychiatry* 2012;11:104-5.
8. Escorpizo R, Kostanjsek N, Kennedy C, Nicol MMR, Stucki G, Üstün TB. Harmonizing WHO's International Classification of Diseases (ICD) and International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF): importance and methods to link disease and functioning. *BMC public health* 2013;13:742.
9. WHO. International classification of functioning disability and health (ICF). Geneva: World Health Organization 2001.

10. Burgess PM, Harris MG, Coombs T, Pirkis JE. A systematic review of clinician-rated instruments to assess adults' levels of functioning in specialised public sector mental health services. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2017;51:338-54.
11. Linden M, Baron S. [The "Mini-ICF-Rating for Mental Disorders (Mini-ICF-P)". A short instrument for the assessment of disabilities in mental disorders]. *Rehabilitation* 2005;44:144-51.
12. Linden M, Baron S, Muschalla B. Mini-ICF-APP: Mini-ICF-Rating für Aktivitäts- und Partizipationsstörungen bei psychischen Erkrankungen; ein Kurzinstrument zur Fremdbeurteilung von Aktivitäts- und Partizipationsstörungen bei psychischen Erkrankungen in Anlehnung an die Internationale Klassifikation der Funktionsfähigkeit, Behinderung und Gesundheit (ICF) der Weltgesundheitsorganisation. Ankerdefinitionen: Huber; 2009.
13. Balestrieri M, Isola M, Bonn R, et al. Validation of the Italian version of Mini-ICF-APP, a short instrument for rating activity and participation restrictions in psychiatric disorders. *Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences* 2013;22:81-91.
14. Molodynski A, Linden M, Juckel G, et al. The reliability, validity, and applicability of an English language version of the Mini-ICF-APP. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 2013;48:1347-54.
15. Pinna F, Fiorillo A, Tusconi M, Guiso B, Carpinello B. Assessment of functioning in patients with schizophrenia and schizoaffective disorder with the Mini-ICF-APP: a validation study in Italy. *International journal of mental health systems* 2015;9:37.
16. Wciórka J, Anczewska M, Jahołkowski P, Świtaj P. Psychometric evaluation of the polish version of the MINI-ICF-APP – a concise measure of limitations on activity and restrictions on participation according to the international classification of functioning, disability and health (ICF) – in people with mental disorders. *Postępy Psychiatrii i Neurologii* 2018;27:218-31.
17. Egger ST, Weniger G, Muller M, Bobes J, Seifritz E, Vetter S. Assessing the severity of functional impairment of psychiatric disorders: equipercentile linking the mini-ICF-APP and CGI. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2019;17:174.
18. Canela C, Schleifer R, Dube A, et al. [Assessment of Functioning when Conducting Occupational Capacity Evaluations--What is "Evidence-Based"?]. *Psychiatr Prax* 2016;43:74-81.
19. Habermeyer B, Kaiser S, Kawohl W, Seifritz E. [Assessment of incapacity to work and the Mini-ICF-APP]. *Neuropsychiatrie* 2017;31:182-6.
20. Muschalla B, Rau H, Willmund GD, Knaevelsrud C. Work disability in soldiers with posttraumatic stress disorder, posttraumatic embitterment disorder, and not-event-related common mental disorders. *Psychol Trauma* 2018;10:30-5.
21. Muschalla B. Psychological capacity limitations according to Mini-ICF-APP are differently related with sick leave in patients from different professional fields. *J Psychosom Res* 2019;124:109741.
22. Guy W. ECDEU assessment manual for psychopharmacology. Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, National Institute of Mental Health, Psychopharmacology Research Branch, Division of Extramural Research Programs; 1976.
23. Spielmans GI, McFall JP. A comparative meta-analysis of Clinical Global Impressions change in antidepressant trials. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease* 2006;194:845-52.
24. Busner J, Targum SD. The clinical global impressions scale: applying a research tool in clinical practice. *Psychiatry* 2007;4:28.
25. Rush Jr A, First MB, Blacker DE. Handbook of psychiatric measures. Philadelphia: American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc.; 2008.
26. Nierenberg AA, DeCecco LM. Definitions of antidepressant treatment response, remission, nonresponse, partial response, and other relevant outcomes: a focus on treatment-resistant depression. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 2001;62 Suppl 16:5-9.

27. Berk M, Ng F, Dodd S, et al. The validity of the CGI severity and improvement scales as measures of clinical effectiveness suitable for routine clinical use. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice* 2008;14:979-83.
28. Ford JK, MacCallum RC, Tait M. The application of exploratory factor analysis in applied psychology: A critical review and analysis. *Personnel psychology* 1986;39:291-314.
29. Kline RB. *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*: Guilford publications; 2015.
30. Hooper D, Coughlan J, Mullen MR. Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Electronic journal of business research methods* 2008;6:53-60.
31. Brown JD. The Cronbach alpha reliability estimate. *JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter* 2002;6.
32. Hinkin TR. A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational research methods* 1998;1:104-21.
33. Williams B, Onsmann A, Brown T. Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Australasian Journal of Paramedicine* 2010;8.
34. Rucci P, Balestrieri M. Exploratory factor analysis of the Mini instrument for the observer rating according to ICF of Activities and Participation in Psychological disorders (Mini-ICF-APP) in patients with severe mental illness. *J Psychopathol* 2015;21:254-61.
35. Jonas WB, Chez RA, Smith K, Sakallaris B. Salutogenesis: the defining concept for a new healthcare system. *Global advances in health and medicine* 2014;3:82-91.
36. Amering M, Schmolke M. Recovery—basics and concepts. M Amering and M Schmolke, *Recovery in mental health: Reshaping scientific and clinical responsibilities* 2009:9-57.
37. Mendel WM, Rapport S. Determinants of the decision for psychiatric hospitalization. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 1969;20:321-8.
38. Braunger C, Muller G, von Wietersheim J, Oster J. [Change of Symptom Severity and Functioning According to ICF in the In-Patient Psychosomatic Rehabilitation]. *Die Rehabilitation* 2018.
39. Giff TE, Strauss JS, Harder DW. The severity of psychiatric disorder. *Psychiatry research* 1980;3:31-40.
40. Zimmerman M, Morgan TA, Stanton K. The severity of psychiatric disorders. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)* 2018;17:258-75.
41. Amering M, Schmolke M. *Recovery in mental health: reshaping scientific and clinical responsibilities*: John Wiley & Sons; 2009.

	Total	NCD	AUD	SUD	SPD	BPD	MDD	AXD	PD	NDD	p-value
	n=3178	n=46	n=1734	n=141	n=478	n=80	n=272	n=112	n=286	n=29	
Age in years (mean, SD)	43.50 (11.88)	43.56 (10.21)	45.00 (11.65)	42.50 (10.83)	41.23 (12.71)	43.84 (12.30)	43.43 (11.25)	40.75 (10.90)	39.74 (11.68)	43.28 (13.38)	n.s.
Gender											
Male n, (%)	2109 (66.36)	33 (71.74)	1289 (74.34)	80 (56.74)	290 (60.67)	44 (55.00)	147 (54.04)	68 (60.71)	135 (47.20)	23 (79.31)	*AUD
Female n, (%)	1069 (33.64)	13 (28.26)	445 (25.66)	61 (43.26)	188 (39.33)	36 (45.00)	125 (45.96)	44 (39.29)	151 (52.80)	6 (20.69)	n.s.
Civil Status n, (%)											
Single	1746 (54.94)	27 (58.70)	819 (47.23)	75 (53.19)	373 (78.03)	34 (42.50)	126 (46.32)	58 (51.790)	211 (73.78)	23 (79.31)	n.s.
Married	536 (16.87)	8 (17.39)	331 (19.09)	26 (18.44)	34 (7.11)	14 (17.50)	76 (27.94)	18 (16.070)	26 (9.09)	3 (10.34)	n.s.
Separated	132 (4.15)	0 (0)	86 (4.96)	3 (2.13)	9 (1.88)	6 (7.50)	12 (4.41)	7 (6.25)	8 (2.80)	1 (3.45)	n.s.
Divorced	702 (22.08)	11 (23.91)	457 (26.36)	35 (24.82)	58 (12.13)	25 (31.25)	51 (18.75)	26 (23.21)	38 (13.29)	1 (3.45)	
Widowed	57 (1.80)	0 (0)	3 (0.17)	2 (1.42)	4 (0.84)	1 (1.25)	7 (2.57)	3 (2.68)	1 (0.35)	1 (3.45)	n.s.
Unknown	5 (0.16)	0 (0)	3 (0.17)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0.70)	0 (0)	n.s.
Education n, (%)											
Primary School	591 (18.60)	15 (32.61)	190 (10.96)	19 (13.48)	159 (33.26)	21 (26.25)	68 (25.00)	32 (28.57)	82 (28.67)	5 (17.24)	*SPD
Secondary School	103 (3.24)	0 (0)	55 (3.17)	2 (1.42)	25 (5.23)	7 (8.75)	6 (2.21)	0 (0)	7 (2.45)	19 (65.52)	n.s.
Apprenticeship	1766 (55.57)	25 (54.35)	1091 (62.92)	87 (61.70)	168 (35.15)	29 (36.25)	132 (48.53)	61 (54.46)	154 (53.85)	1 (3.45)	n.s.
College/University	388 (12.21)	1 (2.17)	261 (15.05)	18 (12.77)	39 (8.16)	16 (20.00)	28 (10.29)	8 (7.14)	17 (5.94)	0 (0)	n.s.
None/Unknown	328 (10.32)	4 (8.70)	135 (7.79)	5 (3.55)	87 (18.20)	5 (6.25)	38 (13.97)	11 (9.82)	26 (9.09)	4 (13.79)	n.s.
Length of stay (mean, SD)	41.49 (44.73)	37.61 (32.91)	34.21 (33.24)	37.88 (29.41)	50.22 (44.95)	57.44 (52.04)	53.29 (58.08)	58.85 (47.09)	50.44 (76.03)	47.00 (42.90)	n.s.
Severity CGI (mean, SD)	5.27 (0.91)	5.41 (1.02)	5.17 (0.90)	5.18 (1.06)	5.61 (0.89)	5.46 (0.84)	5.34 (0.85)	5.25 (0.92)	5.22 (0.87)	5.21 (0.78)	n.s.
mini-ICF-APP (mean, SD)											
sum score	18.53 (10.34)	20.57 (11.30)	16.91 (10.34)	20.13 (11.28)	22.01 (10.61)	20.91 (10.20)	19.88 (9.20)	19.94 (9.09)	18.80 (8.79)	19.83 (9.08)	n.s.
positive items	2.30 (3.08)	3.13 (3.80)	1.84 (2.77)	2.56 (3.44)	3.53 (3.69)	2.83 (3.54)	2.60 (3.00)	2.72 (2.92)	2.20 (2.63)	2.69 (3.30)	n.s.

Table 1: demographic and clinical characteristics of the study sample. Significance levels: n.s.: non-significant; *: $p < 0.5$; **: $p < 0.01$; ***: $p < 0.001$




Figure 1: Response to each Item (Item 1: adherence; Item 2: planning; Item 3: flexibility; Item 4: competency; Item 5: endurance; Item 6: assertiveness; Item 7: contact; Item 8: group; Item 9: relations; Item 10: leisure; Item 11: self-care; Item 12: mobility; and Item 13: judgement) for the whole spectrum of severity (Likert type scale: 0 = none; 1, minimal; 2= mild; 3=moderate and 4= severe)

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Item 11	Item 12	Item 13
Item 1: adherence	1	0.64	0.55	0.52	0.49	0.49	0.36	0.49	0.53	0.40	0.43	0.47	0.39
Item 2: planning	0.44	1	0.67	0.65	0.60	0.60	0.49	0.53	0.57	0.44	0.59	0.46	0.38
Item 3: flexibility	0.42	0.55	1	0.61	0.60	0.57	0.53	0.56	0.58	0.49	0.56	0.42	0.37
Item 4: competency	0.37	0.50	0.48	1	0.60	0.54	0.49	0.53	0.56	0.44	0.58	0.45	0.43
Item 5: endurance	0.38	0.46	0.48	0.48	1	0.56	0.58	0.52	0.56	0.48	0.52	0.38	0.38
Item 6: assertiveness	0.34	0.47	0.47	0.41	0.44	1	0.55	0.44	0.44	0.41	0.48	0.33	0.27
Item 7: contact	0.20	0.35	0.40	0.33	0.44	0.38	1	0.52	0.50	0.44	0.49	0.29	0.30
Item 8: group	0.29	0.36	0.41	0.32	0.36	0.28	0.35	1	0.77	0.55	0.58	0.46	0.42
Item 9: relations	0.34	0.40	0.44	0.38	0.39	0.31	0.36	0.57	1	0.54	0.59	0.50	0.49
Item 10: leisure	0.28	0.31	0.37	0.31	0.33	0.29	0.28	0.36	0.34	1	0.47	0.34	0.29
Item 11: self-care	0.28	0.43	0.42	0.40	0.35	0.31	0.30	0.36	0.37	0.29	1	0.48	0.46
Item 12: mobility	0.29	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.23	0.17	0.16	0.27	0.30	0.20	0.23	1	0.60
Item 13: judgement	0.25	0.22	0.23	0.26	0.24	0.16	0.19	0.25	0.35	0.17	0.27	0.43	1

Table 2: Inter-correlation between Items. In the lower half the dichotomous ratings are presented. In the upper half the ratings using the whole spectrum of severity are presented (inter-correlations >0.50 are bold).

		1 Factor Model					2 Factor Model					3 Factor Model					4 Factor Model				
	Alpha	EV	CFI	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI	EV	CFI	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI	EV	CFI	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI	EV	CFI	RMSR	RMSEA	TLI
Total	0.93	5.222	0.882	0.053	0.080	0.859	1.246	0.903	0.048	0.079	0.881	0.907	-	-	-	-	0.702	-	-	-	-
NCD	0.90	6.130	0.881	0.053	0.087	0.858	1.434	0.881	0.051	0.087	0.860	1.131	0.885	0.052	0.086	0.860	0.830	-	-	-	-
AUD	0.87	5.073	0.881	0.053	0.088	0.857	1.284	0.881	0.053	0.087	0.855	0.881	-	-	-	-	0.769	-	-	-	-
SUD	0.89	5.920	0.881	0.054	0.087	0.857	1.282	0.925	0.045	0.069	0.909	0.924	-	-	-	-	0.845	-	-	-	-
SPD	0.90	5.792	0.872	0.055	0.087	0.847	1.177	0.922	0.045	0.071	0.905	0.865	-	-	-	-	0.770	-	-	-	-
BPD	0.91	6.335	0.882	0.053	0.086	0.859	1.348	0.885	0.052	0.086	0.859	1.017	0.896	0.050	0.082	0.873	0.843	-	-	-	-
MDD	0.84	4.475	0.884	0.053	0.087	0.861	1.317	0.896	0.053	0.084	0.870	1.202	0.948	0.036	0.061	0.933	0.926	-	-	-	-
AXD	0.82	4.287	0.884	0.053	0.086	0.861	1.481	0.908	0.052	0.076	0.887	1.171	0.924	0.049	0.076	0.899	1.104	0.924	0.046	0.071	0.904
PD	0.82	4.214	0.882	0.054	0.088	0.859	1.240	0.888	0.053	0.086	0.859	1.140	0.849	0.036	0.083	0.936	0.904	-	-	-	-
NDD	0.89	5.939	0.881	0.054	0.087	0.857	1.420	0.897	0.051	0.084	0.874	1.206	0.847	0.051	0.081	0.870	0.995	-	-	-	-

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha. Eigenvalues and fit indices for the different factor models, according to diagnostic group EV: Eigenvalue; CFI: Comparative Fit Index ; RMSR: Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation ; TLI: Tucker Lewis Index.

