

REVIEW ARTICLE

USE OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF FUNCTIONING, DISABILITY AND HEALTH: A LITERATURE SURVEY

Jennifer Jelsma

From the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

Background: In 2001 the World Health Organization adopted the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) and it has since been utilized extensively.

Aim: A literature survey was undertaken to document reported use of the ICF, with regard to type of use, aims and implementation issues.

Methods: A convenience sample of 243 papers was analysed.

Results: There were few papers from developing countries, with USA and German authors responsible for almost 50% of the papers. The papers were published in 105 journals covering varying disciplines, health conditions and sectors. Problems included missing or overlapping codes, and codes that were inadequately granular. The Activity/Participation Category qualifiers presented users with the most challenges, and non-standard use of the qualifiers was often reported. The need for a category classifying Personal Factors was identified.

Conclusion: The ICF has already made a major impact on the way in which data concerning disability are conceptualized, collected and processed. Utilization in developing countries must be encouraged. The addition and clarification of certain codes should be considered by the World Health Organization. There is a clear need for a classification of personal factors to allow for complete reporting on the experience of disability.

Key words: ICF, literature review, coding, qualifiers, personal factors.

J Rehabil Med 2009; 41: 1–12

Correspondence address: Jennifer Jelsma, Division of Physiotherapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town, Anzio Road, Observatory, ZA-7925 Cape Town, South Africa. E-mail: jennifer.jelsma@uct.ac.za

Submitted May 2, 2008; accepted September 22, 2008

INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) officially replaced the outdated International Classification of Impairment, Disability and Handicap (ICIDH) (1) with the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) in 2001 (2). The ICF was developed based on the experience and feedback of stakeholders who had found the original ICIDH unsatisfactory in some way. A search of the published literature cited by PubMed indicates that in the period 2001–07 there were more than 400 papers published referencing the ICF. The ICF

has clearly fulfilled its promise and become the generally accepted framework within which to describe functioning in rehabilitation, as well as to document health and disability (3). Extensive work has been carried out on the development of core sets relevant to specific health conditions (4–7) and on the linking of information gained from measurement instruments to the ICF codes (8, 9). The ICF framework and structure have been widely described and discussed (10–12) and will not be elaborated on in this paper.

The ICF is a complex classification, representing an important conceptual framework for understanding and unpacking the experience of disability on the one hand, and a systematic classification that allows for the coding of all components of health and functioning on the other. It would be of interest to establish how the conceptual framework is interpreted and how the data collection components, the codes and the qualifiers are applied in practice.

It is anticipated by the WHO that the ICF will undergo a continuous process of updating and ultimate revision, based on input from interested parties. To this end the Functioning and Disability Reference Group (FDRG) was established in 2006 with different task groups working under its umbrella, including a task team dedicated to producing coding guidelines and a project group devoted to developing mechanisms for gathering data related to revision and updating the classification and the codes (13). There is thus an identified need for ongoing monitoring of the literature to identify aspects of the ICF that users have identified as being problematic.

The ICF was developed through extensive collaboration with stakeholders across disciplines, countries and cultures. However, it is not known whether there is continued involvement of researchers from diverse countries and cultures in the utilization and further development and use of the classification.

Several sets of guidelines are available to assist the user. Apart from the guidelines to use and coding presented within the full ICF version (2) and the on-line beginners guide (14), other comprehensive guidelines have been developed, such as the ICF Australian User Guidelines (15) and the Procedural Manual and Guide for a Standardised Application of the ICF developed under the auspices of the American Psychological Association (11). Although these guidelines are available, it is not known whether users are in fact utilizing these documents.

In order to address the above concerns a literature survey was undertaken. The objectives of this survey were as follows:

- To document the country of origin of authors and the journals in which articles were published.

- To determine the aims of the papers, e.g. to present or apply the conceptual framework or to collect and analyse data using the ICF.
- To establish the type of study designs used and the populations that were included in the studies.
- To identify problems encountered with regard to the utilization of the domain codes and of the qualifiers.
- To establish what coding guidelines were used.

METHODS

Sample

A literature survey was performed using the key words International Classification of Functioning and ICF. The databases searched were PubMed, the Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), SwetsWise and disability-specific sources such as the Center for International Rehabilitation Research Information and Exchange database (CIRRIE). The inclusion criteria were that the paper had to have included the ICF or International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health in the key words or the abstract of the article. The sample was limited to full papers that could be sourced by the author during the research period (March to June, 2007). Letters, discussion threads, doctoral dissertations and conference abstracts were excluded. Papers that referred to the ICIDH or ICIDH2 rather than the ICF were excluded, as were papers that referred to the framework but did not apply it explicitly to data gathering or analysis.

Instrumentation

A data-entry sheet was developed and piloted. The intention was to capture quantitative data to describe the studies and to carry out post-coding of the more qualitative aspects of coding use experience. Specific variables included details of author, journal, discipline, research design and method of data collection, sample, coding problems (post-coded), use of guidelines and qualifier usage, i.e. capacity/performance, barriers/facilitators for the Environmental factors. The author read through each article and entered information presented in each paper into the spreadsheet. Narrative data, related to problems with the use of specific codes or qualifiers were entered verbatim into the spreadsheet.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to present the data. The frequency of the quantitative data, such as journal and country of origin was directly calculated. The written comments were examined to establish if there were common categories, and similar responses were collapsed into these overarching categories. In this way, categories such as missing codes, overlapping codes and insufficiently granular codes were identified and the frequency of responses calculated.

RESULTS

A total of 303 articles that included ICF in their key words or abstracts were identified and sourced. Of these, 60 did not meet the inclusion criteria. The remaining 243, written by 188 different first authors, were analysed. A list of the studies analysed is given in Appendix 1. Five authors were first author on 4 or more papers: Peterson (4 papers), Stamm (4 papers), Grill (5 papers), Stucki (8 papers) and Cieza (10 papers) and, with the exception of Peterson, all were linked to the ICF Research Branch of the WHO Collaborating Center for the Family of International Classifications at the German Institute of Medical Documentation and Information (DIMDI).

The date of publication is presented in Table I.

Table I. Date of publication. (Note: search was completed in June 2007)

Year	n (%)
2001	2 (1)
2002	9 (4)
2003	25 (10)
2004	58 (24)
2005	64 (26)
2006	61 (25)
2007	24 (10)
Total	243 (100)

The 25 countries of origin of the first authors are listed in Table II. Approximately 50% of the papers originated in either the USA or Germany, and generally English-speaking countries predominated (46%) (note that the search was limited to English language publications).

The articles were published in 105 different journals, which ranged from condition-specific (e.g. lupus), to profession-specific (e.g. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*) and journals dedicated to rehabilitation issues (e.g. *Technology and Disability*) (Table III). *Disability and Rehabilitation* accounted for 21% of the publications, followed by the *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* (13%). The journals that contributed 3 or more papers (1.2%) to the database are listed in Table III. The majority of the papers were not discipline-specific, but of the 55 that were, 22 (9% of the total) were contributed by Communication Science, followed by 10 (4%) from Occupational Therapy and 8 from both Nursing and Physiotherapy (3.3% each).

The aims of the reported studies varied widely (Table IV). The most common aims were to either explain or critique the conceptual framework and/or structure of the ICF (23%) (3,

Table II. Country of origin of first author

Country	n (%)
Germany	55 (23)
USA	55 (23)
The Netherlands	21 (9)
UK	19 (8)
Canada	18 (7)
Sweden	18 (7)
Australia	13 (5)
Switzerland	8 (3)
Austria	5 (2)
Italy	5 (2)
South Africa	5 (2)
Japan	3 (1)
Norway	3 (1)
Denmark	2 (0.8)
Ireland	2 (0.8)
New Zealand	2 (0.8)
Spain	2 (0.8)
Bangladesh	1 (0.4)
Czechoslovakia	1 (0.4)
Finland	1 (0.4)
France	1 (0.4)
India	1 (0.4)
Nepal	1 (0.4)
Rwanda	1 (0.4)
Total	243 (100)

Table III. *Most common publication journals*

Journal	n (%)
Disability and Rehabilitation	50 (21)
Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine	30 (13)
Rehabilitation Education	9 (4)
Journal of Communication Disorders	5 (3)
Physical Therapy	5 (2)
Quality of Life Research	5 (2)
Australian Occupational Therapy Journal	4 (2)
Journal Rheumatology	4 (2)
Rehabilitation in Psychology	4 (2)
Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases	3 (1)
Aphasiology	3 (1)
Clinical Rheumatology	3 (1)
Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics	3 (1)
Spinal Cord	3 (1)

11, 16–70) and to apply the ICF concepts to either discipline- or condition-specific management or surveys of clients (27%) (17, 21, 59, 68, 71–134). The next most common stated aim was to link the ICF to new or existing measures of functional ability to allow for recoding of retrospective or prospective data collected with instruments such as the Functional Independence Measure (FIM™) or Short Form 36 (SF-36) (21%) or to explore how the ICF concepts are incorporated into existing measures (8, 9, 135–184). The German ICF Collaborating Centre produced most of the 38 (16%) papers dealing with the identification and validation of core sets for different disease states (4–7, 9, 93, 185–217). The ICF was applied with the aim of collecting data on functional status in 10% of the papers (218–240) and there were few papers on the psychometric properties of the classification, (3%) (80, 148, 241–247).

It was difficult to identify the precise study design in some of the papers as several utilized mixed methodologies. Qualitative methods included interviews, focus groups and case studies, whereas the most commonly utilized quantitative methodology was descriptive survey. The most frequent system that was investigated was the musculo-skeletal system (13%) and there were papers on rheumatoid arthritis, osteo-arthritis and ankylosing spondylitis. (Table V). Neurological conditions (11%) included stroke, spinal cord injuries and Alzheimer's disease.

Three major problem areas were identified with regard to coding: missing codes, overlapping codes and lack of differentiation of lower order codes (lack of granularity). The lack of 51 specific codes was identified by the authors (Table VI), the most commonly cited lack was to do with the respiratory system.

Table IV. *Broad aims of the studies*

Aim*	n (%)
Explain conceptual framework	56 (23)
Apply concepts to management	67 (28)
Link to existing instruments	51 (21)
Core sets	38 (16)
Data collection using ICF	22 (9)
Psychometric properties	8 (3)
Missing/unclear/other	3 (1)

*Note that some studies had more than one aim.

ICF: international classification of functioning, disability and health.

Table V. *Specific health conditions*

Condition	n (%)
Musculo-skeletal	32 (13)
Neurological	26 (11)
Children with disability	23 (9)
Speech and language	16 (7)
Disabled adults	18 (8)
Geriatric	9 (4)
Psychiatric	7 (3)
Intellectual impairment	4 (2)
Visually impaired	4 (2)
Cancer	3 (1)
HIV	3 (1)
Cerebral palsy	2 (1)
Respiratory	2 (1)
Other	7 (3)
Missing/Not applicable	87 (35)
Total	243 (100)

Some codes were incorrectly identified as lacking by the authors (e.g. aphasia, b167, Mental functions of language; fitness, d570 looking after one's health) and these were not included.

As listed in Table VII, 10 overlapping codes were identified in 7 papers (11, 201, 202, 224, 233, 240, 245) and in some cases it was queried if one or the other or both codes should be used. Nine papers reported lack of specificity (granularity) and the need to link several items from other linked instruments to a single ICF code, especially emotional functions (154, 155, 183, 224, 231) and pain (154, 176, 189, 210, 245).

Several authors mentioned that it was difficult to code the time dimension, this included loss of time (10, 155, 183, 189, 220, 245), change over time, deterioration over time and time management (183, 220). The lack of codes for personal factors was noted in several papers (82, 145, 191, 212, 215, 223) and the difficulty of coding general health condition (248) and perception of self-health (82, 155) was also reported. One author suggested that the ICF include a subjective dimension, which would include such items as satisfaction with body functions and structures, with activities and with participation (66). The inability to code subjective experiences was also noted by another researcher (231).

Qualifiers were only used or discussed as per defined usage in 34 (14%) of the papers. The use of qualifiers was regarded as the most difficult part of training people to use the ICF (43), although one author reported the qualifiers to be useful and reliable (147) (Table VIII).

There was little consensus regarding the distinction between Activity/Participation codes (136) with some authors making no distinction between the two (138) and others suggesting that the two are distinct and should be separate (241). Chapireau suggests that the options presented in the ICF booklet make this more difficult to code (39).

There were similar differences in opinion regarding the use of the capacity and performance qualifiers (Table IX). Some researchers felt that they were useful tools to understand the effect of therapy; whereas others pointed out that it was very difficult to define a "standard environment" (11, 39). In addition there were varying interpretations: capacity is ability to

Table VI. Factors for which only a general code, or no suitable code, could be found

Broad category	Unable to code (Ref)	Frequency	
Health condition	Co-morbidities (212)	1	
	Disease management (210)	1	
	Side-effects of medication (183)	1	
	Current treatment (183)	1	
	General healthy (248)	1	
Body structure	Body composition (194)	1	
Body function	<i>Mental state</i>		
	Appearance, self image (220)	1	
	Auto-mutilation (224)	1	
	Choosing not to do activities due to health condition (10, 218)	2	
	Feeling restless (224)	1	
	Neglect (224)	1	
	Passive activity, e.g. daytime sleep or doing nothing (221, 224)	2	
	Stigma (220)	1	
	Suicidal thoughts (152)	1	
	<i>Respiratory</i>		
	Need more specification (183)	1	
	Cyanosis/ "paleness" (224, 231)	2	
	Production of/type of sputum (183, 224)	2	
	<i>Movement-related functions</i>		
	Influence of compensatory movements (215)	1	
	Morning stiffness/joint stiffness (109, 176)	2	
	Muscle coordination (215)	1	
	Muscular balance (215)	1	
	Dynamic posture (215)	1	
	Activities	Developmental milestones (10, 220)	2
		Falling and fear of falling (215)	1
		Reaching for high objects (248)	1
		Turning head (e.g. while driving) (109, 248)	2
	Urge to move (224)	1	
	Environmental	Employers policies (224)	1
		Personal factors	General lack (82, 145, 191, 212, 215, 223)
	Automatic activation (41)		1
Autonomy (41)	1		
Perception of own health and QoL (147, 155, 218)	3		
Life traumas (224)	1		
Loss of control, helplessness, dependence (189, 224, 235)	3		
Loss of future plans (152, 224)	2		
Lying to achieve goals (150)	1		
Personal resources (153)	1		
Psychological status (212)	1		
Satisfaction (152)	1		
Self realization (145)	1		
Smoking/drinking (152)	1		
Subjective experience (41, 82)	2		
Intrapersonal performance (150)	1		
"mind" concept (150)	1		
Volition subsystem (150)	1		
Genetic factors (194)	1		
Coping strategies (212)	1		
Time dimension	Time dimension (10, 155, 183, 189, 220, 245)		6
	History of substance abuse (245)	1	
	Time loss (10, 218)	2	
	Potential problems (153, 231, 233)	3	
	Change in functional status (220, 223)	2	
Space dimension	Experience of space (150)	1	
Total		80	

QoL: quality of life.

Table VII. Problems with specific codes

	Frequency
<i>Overlapping codes</i>	
s4101(arteries)/b415 (blood vessel functions) (245)	1
b122 (global psychosocial)/b117 (intellectual functions) (202)	1
b140 (attention functions)/d160(attention functions) (11)	1
b160 (thought functions)/d163 (thinking) (11)	1
b16711 (expression of written language)/d170 (writing) (11)	1
b550 (Fever: thermoregulatory functions)/b435 (immunological system functions) (201)	1
b810 (protective)/b820 (repair function of skin) (224)	1
d350 (conversation)/d355 (discussion) (11)	1
e4 (attitudes)/e3 (support and relationships) (233, 240)	2
Total	10
<i>Several items linked to one b code</i>	
b1300 (energy level) (155)	1
b152 (emotional functions) (154, 155, 183, 224, 231)	5
b5252 (frequency of defecation (constipation or diarrhoea)) (231)	1
b280 (pain) (154, 176, 189, 210, 245)	5
b460 (dyspnoea and wheezing) (183)	1
d570 (looking after one's health) (224)	1
Total	14

function in an optimal environment (50) or within an environmentally adjusted environment (39); capacity equates to can do, whereas performance implies does do (164); capacity can be equated to activity, whereas performance can be equated to participation (24, 145). The qualifiers were taken by some authors to refer to the amount of assistance required (245) or amount of time difficulty was experienced (242) rather than the amount of difficulty that is experienced with each item. Very few papers mentioned whether capacity was measured with or without aids or assistance.

With regard to the Environmental Factors, one paper mentioned that the qualifiers are not reliable and that the e3 and e4 domains are weak (80). Two papers mentioned the problem of the same factor being both a facilitator and a barrier for different categories and at different times (233, 240). One paper queried whether each independent code, each component and capacity/performance should be coded for separately in the e codes (44). Three papers only reported barriers and excluded facilitators (130, 212, 240) and one did not use the qualifiers but dichotomized the codes (240).

Of the 87 authors who drew ICF-related conclusions, the majority (55) recommended that it should be used where appropriate. Several authors recommended that the personal factors classification needs to be developed (82, 145, 191,

Table VIII. Use of qualifiers

	n (%)
Not used or mentioned	210 (86)
Used or mentioned as per manual	23 (10)
Developed own definitions of each level of qualifier (e.g. related to level of assistance) (166, 170, 226, 246)	4 (1.5)
Dichotomized (130, 202, 231, 232)	4 (1.5)
Different number of levels (130, 226)	2 (1)
Total	243 (100)

Table IX. Capacity and performance qualifiers

Aspect		n (%)
Definitions of capacity and performance	Explains difference – capacity defined as no assistance (26, 137)	2 (0.8)
	Confusion as to capacity – taken as with assistance. Grades of capacity are incorrectly taken to be grades of assistance instead of grades of difficulty without assistance (245) or % of time that task can be done (242)	2 (0.8)
	Complete overlap between capacity and performance. Only capacity used (80)	1 (0.4)
	Activity = capacity, participation = performance (24,145)	2 (0.8)
	Capacity = can do, performance = does do (164)	1 (0.4)
Environment	Difficulty with defining a standard environment	0 (0.0)
	Definitions of current environment, assistance, best/worst/typical? (11, 39)	2 (0.8)
	Highest level of functioning in neutral environment. Performance improved by environmental changes, capacity by therapy (75)	1 (0.4)
	Capacity reflects environmentally adjusted environment (39)	1 (0.4)
	One factor can be both facilitator and barrier (41)	1 (0.4)
	Capacity – optimal environment (50)	1 (0.4)
General	Correct interpretation, makes distinction	25 (10.3)
	Briefly defined	3 (1.2)
	Does not state which is being coded	2 (0.8)
	Not mentioned/no applicable	175 (72.0)
	Not differentiated	24 (9.9)
Total		243 (100.0)

212, 215, 223) and 6 authors concluded that the reliability of the classification needs to be further investigated (39, 80, 148, 190, 224, 245) (Table X).

Three papers referred to the use of the Australian ICF Users Manual (10, 15, 178) and 3 to the American Psychology Association guidelines for clinical use of the ICF (10, 11, 77), which has not yet been made publicly available.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As the ICF aims to be a “multipurpose classification designed to serve various disciplines and different sectors” (2), it is heart-

Table X. Conclusions drawn by the authors (in papers where conclusions relevant to the ICF were stated)

Conclusion	n (%)
Recommend use	55 (63.2)
Need Personal codes (45, 82, 134, 145, 146, 155, 176, 191, 212, 223)	10 (11.5)
Needs validation/reliability testing for different usages, core sets (7, 148, 194, 201, 246)	5 (5.7)
Time component not possible to code (153, 155, 220)	3 (3.4)
Not appropriate for profession specific assessment (135, 136, 165)	3 (3.4)
Require additional codes (136, 189)	2 (2.3)
Should not be used as measurement instrument but as classification (43, 178)	2 (2.3)
Difficult to operationalize (39)	1 (1.1)
Amendments needed for children’s codes (80)	1 (1.1)
Activity and participation codes should be separated (241)	1 (1.1)
Capacity/performance most useful construct (75)	1 (1.1)
ICF more useful for electronic database than other tools (147)	1 (1.1)
Needs manual to facilitate use (178)	1 (1.1)
Qualifiers for level of assistance should be included (11)	1 (1.1)
Total	87 (100)

ening to see the spread of disciplines, specific health conditions and contexts within which the classification has been applied in the 7 years that it has been in the public domain. Although the point has been made that it cannot replace discipline-specific languages and assessment tools (10), there is an obvious place for the classification in research pertaining to individual disciplines, as well as inter-disciplinary research.

It is of concern that only 6 of the papers published were from developing countries (81, 120, 163, 168, 233, 240), with Germany and the USA responsible for almost 50% of the total. It would seem that the “information paradox” identified by WHO, the situation in which countries with the greatest health burdens and needs have the biggest information gaps (249) persists. There have been some attempts to involve developing countries in ICF-related research. The ICF Research Centre in Germany is collaborating with researchers in Brazil on the development of core codes for HIV (Chieza, personal communication) and in South Africa on the development of core codes for spinal cord injuries (Campbell, personal communication), and these initiatives need to be encouraged.

As can be expected in the introductory phase of a new classification, there were many papers explaining the conceptual framework of the ICF, many of which presented the philosophical underpinnings of the classification and the structural components most succinctly. However, there were also several papers which claimed to use the ICF framework but in fact interpreted it so broadly, and in some cases incorrectly that the authors might almost be accused of jumping onto the ICF “bandwagon” without fully addressing the classification in its entirety. This raises the question of whether the WHO should have proprietary rights over the use of the ICF to the extent that if the classification is to be utilized the users are obliged to comply with the officially endorsed coding guidelines and interpretations, which are subject to rigorous scrutiny before any changes are implemented.

The papers raised many concerns regarding the codes available to the user and the lack of certain codes, the overlapping of certain codes and the lack of “granularity” of certain codes were raised as problems. A clear example is, “b1522, which corresponds to emotions that can include feelings of love, hate, anxiousness, sorrow, joy, fear and anger. The coder is left with only one choice when coding concepts as diverse as ‘anxiety’ and ‘love’. This is an example of a code that might be expanded to a finer level of granularity in a future version of the ICF framework” (245). Another example mentioned by several authors is the limited codes available for pain.

There is a lack of consensus on whether activity should be differentiated by the classification from participation or whether this should be left to the user’s discretion, as is currently the case. This was one of the relatively straightforward problems regarding the choice of codes (apart from omissions or overlap as mentioned above); the use of the qualifiers appeared to be more problematic. The qualifiers of capacity and performance add a level of complexity to the ICF, which, while supported by some, is not found to be desirable by others. Users do not always adhere to the definitions as given in the ICF Booklet (2) and the use of assistance or aids was not noted in any of the publications that reported on capacity.

In addition, the qualifier related to severity of the problem as defined was not universally applied, with some authors collapsing the different level and others dichotomizing into problem/no problem. The reliability of these qualifiers was also questioned. It would appear that the ICF is not being used exclusively as a classification and in some cases the qualifiers are being used to monitor outcome and change in status. In any case, it is essential that the reliability of the qualifiers be established and, for large-scale data collection, a collapsing of the 5 levels of the qualifier into 3 (no, some and severe problems) might enhance reliability (247), even though this could be at the expense of responsiveness.

Many papers called for the development of a classification of personal factors as the gathering of much relevant information concerning participants and clients cannot be standardized at present. In addition, there is confusion between coding attributes such as optimism, confidence and motivation (all coded under b126, Temperament and personality) under body systems rather than regarding these attributes as yet to be coded “personal factors” as discussed by Threats (133). He maintains that the function code should be used if the attribute is as a consequence of a health conditions, whereas personal factors would be present in, for example, a pre-morbid state. Despite the ethical issues surrounding the development of such a classification (35), there is a clear need to be able to understand the interaction between impairments, participation, environment and the reciprocal influence of personal attributes both by these factors and on these factors. The WHO might consider prioritizing the development of such a classification.

These are issues that need to be addressed by the WHO ICF Reference Group and a process is already underway whereby suggested minor and major amendments to the ICF can be submitted for consideration (Nenad Kostanjek, personal communication).

The major shortcoming of this survey is that the papers analysed represent a convenience sample and do not include all papers published up to and during the period of data collection. The sample may therefore be biased in some way, although the spread of journals, authors and research topics was very wide. It might be that a comprehensive, up to date review is almost impossible as the number of papers published using the ICF seems to increase exponentially. A search of PubMed performed in early January 2008, resulted in 38 publications for the last 90 days alone. It is hoped that this review, albeit incomplete, may assist in increasing the understanding of who is using the ICF, for what purposes and what problems are being encountered.

Another limitation of the study is that all data were collected by the researcher. Although the more objective data relating to the source and nature of the articles is unlikely to be affected by this, the more subjective interpretation of the narrative data concerning problems with the usage of the codes and qualifiers may be biased by the author’s own perceptions. However, comments on the paper were received by colleagues experienced in the use of the ICF and it is hoped that any bias would have been identified at this stage.

In conclusion, despite the incomplete database, this survey provides useful information. In the few short years of its existence, the ICF has made a major impact on the way in which data concerning disability is conceptualized, collected and processed. The classification is being used across disciplines, health conditions, sectors and settings. There is still a need, however, to stimulate utilization and publication in developing countries. This review reports several areas in which users have identified difficulties with the use of the classification. These include missing, overlapping or insufficiently granular codes. The use of the qualifiers in the Activities and Participation component seem to present researchers with the greatest challenges and this has led to incorrect and non-standard applications in some cases. There is a clear need for a classification of personal factors to be added to the ICF to allow for complete reporting on the experience of disability.

The WHO has set in a motion a process for updating the ICF and it is hoped that some of the issues raised in this review will be dealt with through this procedure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The members of the Working Group on the Principles of Use, Coding Rules and Guidelines are: Lynn Bufka (American Psychological Association, USA), John Hough (Centre for Disease Control (CDC), USA), Nenad Kostanjek (Classification, Terminology and Standards, World Health Organization), Geoff Reed (International Union of Psychological Science, Spain), under the chairmanship of Diane Caulfeild (Canadian Institute for Health Information, Canada). Thanks to John Hough, from CDC for assistance in sourcing eligible papers.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps: a manual of classification

- relating to the consequences of disease. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1980.
2. World Health Organization. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2001.
 3. Stucki G, Ewert T, Cieza A. Value and application of the ICF in rehabilitation medicine. *Disabil Rehabil* 2002; 24: 932–938.
 4. Cieza A, Ewert T, Ustun TB, et al. Development of ICF Core Sets for patients with chronic conditions. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 9–11.
 5. Cieza A, Schwarzkopf SR, Sigi T, et al. ICF Core Sets for osteoporosis. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 81–86.
 6. Cieza A, Stucki G. New approaches to understanding the impact of musculoskeletal conditions. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2004; 18: 141–154.
 7. Wildner M, Quittan M, Portenier L, et al. ICF Core Set for patients with cardiopulmonary conditions in early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 397–404.
 8. Cieza A, Brockow T, Ewert T, et al. Linking health-status measurements to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *J Rehabil Med* 2002; 34: 205–210.
 9. Cieza A, Geyh S, Chatterji S, et al. ICF linking rules: an update based on lessons learned. *J Rehabil Med* 2005; 37: 212–218.
 10. Bruyere SM, Van Looy SA, Peterson DB. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: contemporary literature overview. *Rehabil Psychol* 2005; 50: 113–121.
 11. Reed G, Lux JB, Bufka LF, et al. Operationalizing the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health in clinical settings. *Rehabil Psychol* 2005; 50: 122–131.
 12. Stucki G. International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF). *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2005; 84: 733–740.
 13. World Health Organization. Report on the WHO-FIC meeting Tunis. Newsletter on the WHO Family of International Classifications 2006; 4: 2–5. Available from: <http://www.rivm.nl/who-fic/newsletter/newsletter2006-2.pdf>
 14. World Health Organization. Towards a common language for functioning, disability and health. World Health Organization; 2002.
 15. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. ICF Australian user guide. In Disability Series. Canberra: AIHW; 2003.
 16. Threats TT. New classifications will aid assessment and intervention. *ASHA Leader* 2001; 6: 12.
 17. Lollar D. Public health and disability: emerging opportunities. *Public Health Rep* 2002; 117: 131.
 18. Steiner WA, Ryser L, Huber E, et al. Use of the ICF model as a clinical problem-solving tool in physical therapy and rehabilitation medicine. *Phys Ther* 2002; 82: 1098–1107.
 19. Stucki G, Cieza A, Ewert T, et al. Application of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) in clinical practice. *Disabil Rehabil* 2002; 24: 281–282.
 20. Svestkova O. Conceptual framework for rehabilitation in the Czech Republic: a proposal. *Disabil Rehabil* 2002; 24: 798–801.
 21. Brush JA, Threats TT, Calkins MP. Influences on perceived function of a nursing home resident. *J Commun Disord* 2003; 36: 379–393.
 22. Gibson L, Strong J. A conceptual framework for functional capacity in occupational therapy work rehabilitation. *Aust Occup Ther J* 2003; 50: 64–71.
 23. Hurst R. The international disability rights movement and the ICF. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 572–576.
 24. Mbogoni M. On the application of the ICIDH and ICF in developing countries: evidence from the United Nations Disability Statistics Database (DISTAT). *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 644.
 25. Stucki G, Ewert T, Cieza A. Value and application of the ICF in rehabilitation medicine. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 628.
 26. Arthanat S, Nochajski SM, Stone J. The international classification of functioning, disability and health and its application to cognitive disorders. *Disabil Rehabil* 2004; 26: 235–245.
 27. Fortune N. A framework for human functioning – the ICF in Australia. *J AHIMA* 2004; 75: 66–68.
 28. Goldstein DN, Cohn E, Coster W. Enhancing participation for children with disabilities: application of the ICF enablement framework to pediatric physical therapist practice. *Pediatr Phys Ther* 2004; 16: 114–120.
 29. Hammell KW. Deviating from the norm: a sceptical interrogation of the classificatory practices of the ICF. *Br J Occup Ther* 2004; 67: 408–411.
 30. Imrie R. Demystifying disability: a review of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *Sociol Health Illn* 2004; 26: 287–305.
 31. Kearney PM, Pryor J. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) and nursing. *J Adv Nurs* 2004; 46: 162–170.
 32. Shaw L, Mackinnon J. A multidimensional view of health. *Education for Health: Change in Learning and Practice* 2004; 17: 213–222.
 33. Ustun B, Chatterji S, Kostanjsek N. Comments from WHO for the Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine Special Supplement on ICF Core Sets. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 7–8.
 34. Biering-Sorensen F, Charlifue SW, DeVivo M, et al. International spinal cord injury data sets. *Spinal Cord* 2006; 44: 530–534.
 35. Peterson DB, Threats T. Ethical and clinical implications of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) in rehabilitation education. *Rehabil Educ* 2005; 19: 129–137.
 36. Peterson D, Rosenthal DA. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health as an allegory for history and systems in rehabilitation education. *Rehabil Educ* 2005; 19: 95–104.
 37. Berger M. The NSF Mental Health Standard 9: the devil is in the delivery! *Child Adolesc Mental Health* 2005; 10: 123–126.
 38. Bruyere SM, Peterson DB. Introduction to the Special Section on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: implications for rehabilitation psychology. *Rehabil Psychol* 2005; 50: 103–104.
 39. Chapiro F. The environment in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *JARID* 2005; 18: 305–311.
 40. Florin J, Ehnfors M, Ostlinder G. Developing a national integrated classification of health care interventions in Sweden. *Int J Med Inform* 2005; 74: 973–979.
 41. Hemmingsson H, Jonsson H. An occupational perspective on the concept of participation in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health – some critical remarks. *Am J Occup Ther* 2005; 59: 569–576.
 42. Homa DB, Peterson DB. Using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) in teaching rehabilitation client assessment. *Rehabil Educ* 2005; 19: 119–128.
 43. Leonardi M, Bickenbach J, Raggi A, et al. Training on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF): the ICF DIN-Basic and the ICF DIN-Advanced Course developed by the Disability Italian Network. *J Headache Pain* 2005; 6: 159–164.
 44. Peterson D. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: an introduction for rehabilitation psychologists. *Rehabil Psychol* 2005; 50: 105–112.
 45. Scherer M, Glueckan R. Assessing the benefits of assistive technologies for activities and participation. *Rehabil Psychol* 2005; 50: 132–145.
 46. Smart J. The promise of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Rehabil Educ* 2005; 19: 191–199.
 47. Peterson DB, Threats T. Introduction to the special issue of Rehabilitation Education: the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Rehabil Educ* 2005; 19: 75–80.
 48. Barrow FH. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF), a new tool for social workers. *J Soc Work Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 5: 65–73.
 49. Colver A. Study protocol: SPARCLE – a multi-centre European

- study of the relationship of environment to participation and quality of life in children with cerebral palsy. *BMC Public Health* 2006; 6: 105.
50. Darzins P, Fone S, Darzins S. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health can help to structure and evaluate therapy. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal* 2006; 53: 127–131.
 51. Jette AM. Toward a common language for function, disability, and health. *Phys Ther* 2006; 86: 726–734.
 52. Lettinga AT, van Twillert S, Poels BJJ, Postema K. Distinguishing theories of dysfunction, treatment and care. Reflections on “describing rehabilitation interventions”. *Clin Rehabil* 2006; 20: 369–374.
 53. Missiuna C, Rivard L, Bartlett D. Exploring assessment tools and the target of intervention for children with developmental coordination disorder. *Phys Occup Ther Pediatr* 2006; 26: 71–89.
 54. Palisano RJ. A collaborative model of service delivery for children with movement disorders: a framework for evidence-based decision making. *Phys Ther* 2006; 86: 1295–1305.
 55. Wang PP, Badley EM, Gignac M. Exploring the role of contextual factors in disability models. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 135–140.
 56. Campbell WN, Skarakis-Doyle E. School-aged children with SLI: the ICF as a framework for collaborative service delivery. *J Commun Disord* 2007; 40: 513–535.
 57. Geuskens GA, Burdorf A, Hazes JM. Consequences of rheumatoid arthritis for performance of social roles – a literature review. *J Rheumatol* 2007; 34: 1248–1260.
 58. Stucki G, Cieza A, Melvin J. The international classification of functioning, disability and health (ICF): a unifying model for the conceptual description of the rehabilitation strategy. *J Rehabil Med* 2007; 39: 279–285.
 59. Ustun TB. Using the International Classification of Functioning, Disease and Health in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: separating the disease from its epiphenomena. *Ambul Pediatr* 2007; 7: 132–139.
 60. Stephens D. World Health Organization’s International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health – ICF. *J Audiological Med* 2001; vii: 7–10.
 61. de Kleijn-de Vrankrijker MW. The long way from the International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps (ICIDH) to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 561–564.
 62. Lehman CA. Idiopathic intracranial hypertension within the ICF model: a review of the literature. *J Neurosci Nurs* 2003; 35: 263–270.
 63. Madden R, Ching C, Sykes C. The ICF as a framework for national data: the introduction of ICF into Australian data dictionaries. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 676.
 64. Nordenfelt L. Action theory, disability and ICF. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 1075–1079.
 65. Schneider M, Hurst R, Miller J, Ustun B. The role of environment in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 588.
 66. Ueda S, Okawa Y. The subjective dimension of functioning and disability: what is it and what is it for? *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 596.
 67. Leahy MM. Changing perspectives for practice in stuttering: echoes from a Celtic past, when wordlessness was entitled to time. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol* 2005; 14: 274–283.
 68. Imms C. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: they’re talking our language. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal* 2006; 53: 65–66.
 69. Nordenfelt L. On health, ability and activity: comments on some basic notions in the ICF. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 1461–1465.
 70. Rimmer JH. Use of the ICF in identifying factors that impact participation in physical activity/rehabilitation among people with disabilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 1087–1095.
 71. Atijosan O, Kuper H, Rischewski D, et al. Musculoskeletal impairment survey in Rwanda: design of survey tool, survey methodology, and results of the pilot study (a cross sectional survey). *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2007; 8: 30.
 72. Beckung E, Hagberg G. Neuroimpairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions in children with cerebral palsy. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2002; 44: 309–316.
 73. Leonardi M, Ustun TB. The global burden of epilepsy. *Epilepsia (Series 4)* 2002; 43: 21–25.
 74. Simeonsson RJ, McMillen JS, Huntington GS. Secondary conditions in children with disabilities: spina bifida as a case example. *Ment Retard Dev Disabil Res Rev* 2002; 8: 198–205.
 75. Bilbao A, Kennedy C, Chatterji S, et al. The ICF: applications of the WHO model of functioning, disability and health to brain injury rehabilitation. *NeuroRehabilitation* 2003; 18: 239–250.
 76. Eadie TL. The ICF: a proposed framework for comprehensive rehabilitation of individuals who use alaryngeal speech. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol* 2003; 12: 189–197.
 77. Kennedy C. Functioning and disability associated with mental disorders: the evolution since ICIDH. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 611–619.
 78. Simeonsson RJ. Classification of communication disabilities in children: contribution of the International Classification on Functioning, Disability and Health. *Int J Audiol* 2003; 42: S2–S8.
 79. Simeonsson RJ, Leonardi M, Lollar D, et al. Applying the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) to measure childhood disability. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 602.
 80. Battaglia M, Russo E, Bolla A, et al. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health in a cohort of children with cognitive, motor, and complex disabilities. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2004; 46: 98–106.
 81. Bormman J. The World Health Organization’s terminology and classification: application to severe disability. *Disabil Rehabil* 2004; 26: 182–188.
 82. Corrigan JD, Bogner J. Latent factors in measures of rehabilitation outcomes after traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil* 2004; 19: 445–458.
 83. Crews JE, Campbell VA. Vision impairment and hearing loss among community-dwelling older Americans: implications for health and functioning. *Am J Public Health* 2004; 94: 823–829.
 84. Gotherstrom U, Persson J, Jonsson D. A socioeconomic model for evaluation of postal and telecommunication services for disabled persons. *Technol Disabil* 2004; 16: 91–99.
 85. Howe T, Worrall L, Hickson L. What is an aphasia-friendly environment? *Aphasiology* 2004; 18: 1015–1037.
 86. Law M, Finkelman S, Hurley P, et al. Participation of children with physical disabilities: relationships with diagnosis, physical function, and demographic variables. *Scand J Occup Ther* 2004; 11: 156–162.
 87. McCloud S, Bleile K. The ICF: a framework for setting goals for children with speech impairment. *Child Lang Teach Ther* 2004; 20: 199–219.
 88. McDonald R, Surtees R, Wirz S. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health provides a model for adaptive seating interventions for children with cerebral palsy. *Br J Occup Ther* 2004; 67: 293–302.
 89. Rosenbaum P, Stewart D. The world health organization international classification of functioning, disability, and health: a model to guide clinical thinking, practice and research in the field of cerebral palsy. *Semin Pediatr Neurol* 2004; 11: 5–10.
 90. Sinnott KA, Dunn JA, Rothwell AG. Use of the ICF conceptual framework to interpret hand function outcomes following tendon transfer surgery for tetraplegia. *Spinal Cord* 2004; 42: 396–400.
 91. Yaruss JS, Quesal RW. Stuttering and the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF): an update. *J Commun Disord* 2004; 37: 35–52.
 92. Bergemalm P-O, Borg E. Peripheral and central audiological sequelae of closed head injury: function, activity, participation and quality of life. *Audiological Med* 2005; 3: 185–198.
 93. Biering-Sorensen F, Scheuringer M, Baumberger M, et al. De-

- veloping core sets for persons with spinal cord injuries based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health as a way to specify functioning. *Spinal Cord* 2006; 44: 541–546.
94. Bedell GM. Developing a follow-up survey focused on participation of children and youth with acquired brain injuries after discharge from inpatient rehabilitation. *Neuro Rehabilitation* 2004; 19: 191–205.
 95. Broekman T, Schippers G, Koeter M, Van Den Brink W. Standardized assessment in substance abuse treatment in the Netherlands: the case of the Addiction Severity Index and new developments. *J Subst Use* 2004; 9: 147–155.
 96. McCooney-O'Halloran R, Worrall L, Hickson L. Evaluating the role of speech-language pathology with patients with communication disability in the acute care hospital setting using the ICF. *J Med Speech Lang Pathol* 2004; 12: 49–58.
 97. Van der Ploeg HP, Van der Beek AJ, Van der Woude LHV, Van Mechelen W. Physical activity for people with a disability: a conceptual model. *Sports Med* 2004; 34: 639–649.
 98. Fucetola R, Tucker F, Blank K, Corbetta M. A process for translating evidence-based aphasia treatment into clinical practice. *Aphasiology* 2005; 19: 411–422.
 99. Colenbrander A. Visual functions and functional vision. *Int Congr Ser* 2005; 1282: 482–486.
 100. Dagfinrud H, Kjekken I, Mowinckel P, et al. Impact of functional impairment in ankylosing spondylitis: impairment, activity limitation, and participation restrictions. *J Rheumatol* 2005; 32: 516–523.
 101. Eliasson A-C. Improving the use of hands in daily activities: aspects of the treatment of children with cerebral palsy. *Phys Occup Ther Pediatr* 2005; 25: 37–60.
 102. Harris J, MacDermid J, Roth J. The International Classification of Functioning as an explanatory model of health after distal radius fracture: a cohort study. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2005; 3: 73.
 103. Hickson L, Worrall L, Wilson J, et al. Evaluating communication for resident participation in an aged care facility. *Adv Speech Lang Pathol* 2005; 7: 245–257.
 104. Henry J, Dennis K, Schechter M. General review of tinnitus: prevalence, mechanisms, effects and management. *J Speech Lang Hear Res* 2005; 48: 1204–1235.
 105. Hollar D. Risk behaviours for varying categories of disability in NELS: 88. *J Sch Health* 2005; 75: 350–358.
 106. Leonardi M, Steiner TJ, Scher AT, Lipton RB. The global burden of migraine: measuring disability in headache disorders with WHO's Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *J Headache Pain* 2005; 6: 429–440.
 107. MacDonald-Wilson KL, Nemeč PB. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) in psychiatric rehabilitation. *Rehabil Educ* 2005; 19: 159–176.
 108. Saunders GH, Chisolm TH, Abrams HB. Measuring hearing aid outcomes – not as easy as it seems. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2005; 42: 157–168.
 109. Schuntermann MF. The implementation of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health in Germany: experiences and problems. *Int J Rehabil Res* 2005; 28: 93–102.
 110. Simmons-Mackie N, Threats TT, Kagan A. Outcome assessment in aphasia: a survey. *J Commun Disord* 2005; 38: 1–27.
 111. Skarakis-Doyle E. Reconceptualizing treatment goals from language impairment to functional limitations; a case study. *Topics Lang Dis* 2005; 25: 353–363.
 112. Smiley DF, Threats TM, Mowry RL, Peterson DB. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF): implications for deafness rehabilitation education. *Rehabil Educ* 2005; 19: 139–158.
 113. Worrall L, Rose T, Howe T, et al. Access to written information for people with aphasia. *Aphasiology* 2005; 19: 923–929.
 114. Worthington C, Myers T, O'Brien K, et al. Rehabilitation in HIV/AIDS: development of an expanded conceptual framework. *AIDS Patient Care STDS* 2005; 19: 258–271.
 115. Barak S, Duncan PW. Issues in selecting outcome measures to assess functional recovery after stroke. *NeuroRX* 2006; 3: 505–524.
 116. Botha-Scheepers S, Riyazi N, Kroon HM, et al. Activity limitations in the lower extremities in patients with osteoarthritis: the modifying effects of illness perceptions and mental health. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2006; 14: 1104–1110.
 117. Braun KVN, Yeargin-Allsopp M, Lollar D. Factors associated with leisure activity among young adults with developmental disabilities. *Res Dev Disabil* 2006; 27: 567–583.
 118. Crews J, Jones G, Kim J. Double jeopardy: the effects of comorbid conditions amongst older people with vision loss. *J Vis Impair Blind* 2006; Special suppl: 824–848.
 119. French HP. Use of questionnaire-based outcomes for the measurement of activities and participation in the physiotherapy management of hip osteoarthritis: a review. *Phys Ther Rev* 2006; 11: 273–288.
 120. Khan NZ, Muslima H, Parveen M, et al. Neurodevelopmental outcomes of preterm infants in Bangladesh. *Pediatrics* 2006; 118: 280–289.
 121. MacEntee MI. An existential model of oral health from evolving views on health, function and disability. *Community Dent Health* 2006; 23: 5–14.
 122. Picciolini O, Gianni M-L, Vegni C, et al. Usefulness of an early neurofunctional assessment in predicting neurodevelopmental outcome in very low birthweight infants. *Arch Disabil Childhood* 2006; 91: 111–117.
 123. Roaldsen KS, Rollman O, Toreburk E, et al. Functional ability in female leg ulcer patients; a challenge for physiotherapy. *Physiother Res Int* 2006; 11: 191–203.
 124. Tempest S, McIntyre A. Using the ICF to clarify team roles and demonstrate clinical reasoning in stroke rehabilitation. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 663–667.
 125. Threats TT. Towards an international framework for communication disorders: use of the ICF. *J Commun Disord* 2006; 39: 251–265.
 126. Van Brakel W, Anderson A, Mutatkar R, et al. The participation scale: measuring a key concept in public health. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 193–203.
 127. Wormgoor MEA, Indahl A, van Tulder MW, Kemper HCG. Functioning description according to the ICF model in chronic back pain: disablement appears even more complex with decreasing symptom specificity. *J Rehabil Med* 2006; 38: 93–99.
 128. Smeets VMJ, van Lierop BAG, Vanhoutvin JPG, et al. Epilepsy and employment: literature review. *Epilepsy Behav* 2007; 10: 354–362.
 129. Taal E, Bobietinska E, Lloyd J, et al. Successfully living with chronic arthritis. *Clin Rheumatol* 2006; 25: 189–197.
 130. Khan F, Pallant JF. Use of International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) to describe patient-reported disability in multiple sclerosis and identification of relevant environmental factors. *J Rehabil Med* 2007; 39: 63–70.
 131. Stamm T, Machold K. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health in practice in rheumatological care and research. *Curr Opin Rheumatol* 2007; 19: 184–189.
 132. Tannenbaum C, Ahmed S, Mayo N. What drives older women's perceptions of health-related quality of life? *Qual Life Res* 2007; 16: 593–605.
 133. Threats TT. Access for persons with neurogenic communication disorders: influences of personal and environmental factors of the ICF. *Aphasiology* 2007; 21: 67–80.
 134. Borell L, Asaba E, Rosenberg L, et al. Exploring experiences of participation among individuals living with chronic pain. *Scand J Occup Ther* 2006; 13: 76–85.
 135. Haglund L, Henriksson C. Concepts in occupational therapy in relation to the ICF. *Occup Ther Int* 2003; 10: 253–268.
 136. Heerkens Y, Van Der Brug Y, Ten Napel H, Van Ravensberg D. Past and future use of the ICF (former ICIDH) by nursing and allied health professionals. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 620.
 137. Hwang J-L, Nochajski S. The ICF and its application with AIDS. *J Rehabil* 2003; 69: 4–12.

138. Jessen EC, Colver AF, Mackie PC, Jarvis SN. Development and validation of a tool to measure the impact of childhood disabilities on the lives of children and their families. *Child Care Health Dev* 2003; 29: 21–34.
139. McDougall J, Miller LT. Measuring chronic health condition and disability as distinct concepts in national surveys of school-aged children in Canada: a comprehensive review with recommendations based on the ICD-10 and ICF. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 922–939.
140. Swanson G, Carrothers L, Mulhorn KA. Comparing disability survey questions in five countries: a study using ICF to guide comparisons. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 665.
141. Weigl M, Cieza A, Harder M, et al. Linking osteoarthritis-specific health-status measures to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF). *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2003; 11: 519–523.
142. Brockow T, Cieza A, Kuhlow H, et al. Identifying the concepts contained in outcome measures of clinical trials on musculoskeletal disorders and chronic widespread pain using the international classification of functioning, disability and health as a reference. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 30–36.
143. Brockow T, Duddeck K, Geyh S, et al. Identifying the concepts contained in outcome measures of clinical trials on breast cancer using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health as a reference. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 43–48.
144. Brockow T, Wohlfahrt K, Hillert A, et al. Identifying the concepts contained in outcome measures of clinical trials on depressive disorders using the international classification of functioning, disability and health as a reference. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 49–55.
145. Granlund M, Eriksson L, Ylven R. Utility of International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health's participation dimension in assigning ICF codes to items from extant rating instruments. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 130–137.
146. Heerkens Y, Engels J, Kuiper C, et al. The use of the ICF to describe work related factors influencing the health of employees. *Disabil Rehabil* 2004; 26: 1060–1066.
147. Mayo NE, Poissant L, Ahmed S, et al. Incorporating the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) into an electronic health record to create indicators of function: proof of concept using the SF-12. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2004; 11: 514–522.
148. Ogonowski J, Kronk R, Rice C, Feldman H. Inter-rater reliability in assigning ICF codes to children with disabilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2004; 26: 353–361.
149. Pryor J, Forbes R, Hall-Pullin L. Is there evidence of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health in undergraduate nursing students' patient assessments? *Int J Nurs Pract* 2004; 10: 134–141.
150. Stamm TA, Cieza A, Machold KP, et al. Content comparison of occupation-based instruments in adult rheumatology and musculoskeletal rehabilitation based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *Arthritis Rheum* 2004; 51: 917–924.
151. Wessels RD, de Witte LP, Jedeloo S, et al. Effectiveness of provision of outdoor mobility services and devices in The Netherlands. *Clin Rehabil* 2004; 18: 371–378.
152. Wolff B, Cieza A, Parentin A, et al. Identifying the concepts contained in outcome measures of clinical trials on four internal disorders using the international classification of functioning, disability and health as a reference. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 37–42.
153. Boldt C, Brach M, Grill E, et al. The ICF categories identified in nursing interventions administered to neurological patients with post-acute rehabilitation needs. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 431–436.
154. Borchers M, Cieza A, Sigl T, et al. Content comparison of osteoporosis-targeted health status measures in relation to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Clin Rheumatol* 2005; 24: 139–144.
155. Cieza A, Stucki G. Content comparison of health-related quality of life (HRQOL) instruments based on the international classification of functioning, disability and health (ICF). *Qual Life Res* 2005; 14: 1225–1237.
156. de Kleijn P, van Genderen FR, van Meeteren NLU. Assessing functional health status in adults with haemophilia: towards a preliminary core set of clinimetric instruments based on a literature search in Rheumatoid Arthritis and Osteoarthritis. *Haemophilia* 2005; 11: 308–318.
157. Erdmann PG, van Meeteren NL, Kalmijn S, et al. Functional health status of patients with chronic inflammatory neuropathies. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2005; 10: 181–189.
158. Morris C, Kurinczuk JJ, Fitzpatrick R. Child or family assessed measures of activity performance and participation for children with cerebral palsy: a structured review. *Child: Care, Health Dev* 2005; 31: 397–407.
159. Msall ME. Measuring functional skills in preschool children at risk for neurodevelopmental disabilities. *Ment Retard Dev Disabil Res Rev* 2005; 11: 263–273.
160. Salter K, Jutai JW, Teasell R, et al. Issues for selection of outcome measures in stroke rehabilitation: ICF activity. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 315–340.
161. Scheuringer M, Grill E, Boldt C, et al. Systematic review of measures and their concepts used in published studies focusing on rehabilitation in the acute hospital and in early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 419–429.
162. Sigl T, Cieza A, van der Heijde D, Stucki G. ICF based comparison of disease specific instruments measuring physical functional ability in ankylosing spondylitis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2005; 64: 1576–1581.
163. Bornman J, Murphy J. Using the ICF in goal setting: clinical application using Talking Mats. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol* 2006; 1: 145–154.
164. Buffart LM, Roebroek ME, Pesch-Batenburg JM, et al. Assessment of arm/hand functioning in children with a congenital transverse or longitudinal reduction deficiency of the upper limb. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 85–95.
165. Guscia R, Ekberg S, Harries J, Kirby N. Measurement of environmental constructs in disability assessment instruments. *J Policy Pract Intellect Disabil* 2006; 3: 173–180.
166. Gwilliam L. Outcome measures following surgery to the rheumatoid hand. *International Congress Series* 2006; 1295: 43–55.
167. Kuijer W, Brouwer S, Preuper HR, et al. Work status and chronic low back pain: exploring the international classification of functioning, disability and health. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 379–388.
168. Harichandrakumar KT, Krishnamoorthy K, Kumari AK, Das LK. Health status of lymphatic filariasis assessed from patients using seven domains five levels (7D5L) instrument. *Acta Trop* 2006; 99: 137–143.
169. Hendershot G, Crews J. Towards international comparability of survey statistics on visual impairment: the DISTAB project. *J Vis Impair Blind* 2006; January: 11–25.
170. Jerosch-Herold C, Leite JC, Song F. A systematic review of outcomes assessed in randomized controlled trials of surgical interventions for carpal tunnel syndrome using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) as a reference tool. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2006; 7: 96.
171. McConachie H, Colver A, Forsyth R, et al. Participation of disabled children: how should it be characterised and measured? *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 1157–1164.
172. Ostensjo S, Bjorbaekmo W, Carlberg EB, Vollestad NK. Assessment of everyday functioning in young children with disabilities: an ICF-based analysis of concepts and content of the Pediatric Evaluation of Disability Inventory (PEDI). *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 489–504.
173. Pollard B, Johnston M, Dieppe P. What do osteoarthritis health outcome instruments measure? Impairment, activity limitation, or participation restriction? *J Rheumatol* 2006; 33: 757–763.
174. Stamm T, Geyh S, Cieza A, et al. Measuring functioning in patients

- with hand osteoarthritis – content comparison of questionnaires based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2006; 45: 1534–1541.
175. Stamm TA, Cieza A, Machold K, et al. Exploration of the link between conceptual occupational therapy models and the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *Aust Occup Ther J* 2006; 53: 9–17.
 176. Weigl M, Cieza A, Kostanjsek N, et al. The ICF comprehensively covers the spectrum of health problems encountered by health professionals in patients with musculoskeletal conditions. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2006; 45: 1247–1254.
 177. Zochling J, Bonjean M, Grill E, et al. Systematic review of measures and their concepts used in published studies focusing on the treatment of acute inflammatory arthritis. *Clin Rheumatol* 2006; 25: 807–813.
 178. Dixon D, Pollard B, Johnston M. What does the chronic pain grade questionnaire measure? *Pain* 2007; 130: 249–253.
 179. Geyh S, Cieza A, Kollerits B, et al. Content comparison of health-related quality of life measures used in stroke based on the international classification of functioning, disability and health (ICF): a systematic review. *Qual Life Res* 2007; 16: 833–851.
 180. Mudge S, Stott NS. Outcome measures to assess walking ability following stroke: a systematic review of the literature. *Physiotherapy* 2007; 93: 189–200.
 181. Muller-Staub M, Lavin MA, Needham I, van Achterberg T. Meeting the criteria of a nursing diagnosis classification: evaluation of ICNP(R), ICF, NANDA and ZEPF. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2007; 44: 702–713.
 182. Schepers VPM, Ketelaar M, van de Port IGL, et al. Comparing contents of functional outcome measures in stroke rehabilitation using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *Disabil Rehabil* 2007; 29: 221–230.
 183. Stucki A, Stucki G, Cieza A, et al. Content comparison of health-related quality of life instruments for COPD. *Respir Med* 2007; 101: 1113–1122.
 184. Geyh S, Kurt T, Brockow T, et al. Identifying the concepts contained in outcome measures of clinical trials on stroke using the international classification of functioning, disability and health as a reference. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 56–62.
 185. Brach M, Cieza A, Stucki G, et al. ICF Core Sets for breast cancer. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 121–127.
 186. Cieza A, Chatterji S, Andersen C, et al. ICF Core Sets for depression. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 128–134.
 187. Cieza A, Stucki A, Geyh S, et al. ICF Core Sets for chronic ischaemic heart disease. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 94–99.
 188. Cieza A, Stucki G, Weigl M, et al. ICF Core Sets for low back pain. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 69–74.
 189. Dreinhofer K, Stucki G, Ewert T, et al. ICF Core Sets for osteoarthritis. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 75–80.
 190. Ewert T, Fuessl M, Cieza A, et al. Identification of the most common patient problems in patients with chronic conditions using the ICF checklist. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 22–29.
 191. Geyh S, Cieza A, Schouten J, et al. ICF Core Sets for stroke. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 135–141.
 192. Newman S. Commentary on Supplement 44: G. ICF Core Sets for chronic conditions. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 186–188.
 193. Ruof J, Cieza A, Wolff B, et al. ICF Core Sets for diabetes mellitus. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 100–106.
 194. Stucki A, Daansen P, Fuessl M, et al. ICF Core Sets for obesity. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 107–113.
 195. Stucki A, Stoll T, Cieza A, et al. ICF Core Sets for obstructive pulmonary diseases. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; 36: 114–120.
 196. Stucki G, Cieza A. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) Core Sets for rheumatoid arthritis: a way to specify functioning. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2004; 63 Suppl 2: ii40–ii45.
 197. Stucki G, Cieza A, Geyh S, et al. ICF Core Sets for rheumatoid arthritis. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 87–93.
 198. Weigl M, Cieza A, Andersen C, et al. Identification of relevant ICF categories in patients with chronic health conditions: a Delphi exercise. *J Rehabil Med* 2004; Suppl 44: 12–21.
 199. Boldt C, Grill E, Wildner M, et al. ICF Core Set for patients with cardiopulmonary conditions in the acute hospital. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 375–380.
 200. Byrne K, Orange J. Conceptualizing communication enhancement in dementia for family caregivers using the WHO – ICF framework. *Adv Speech Lang Pathol* 2005; 7: 187–202.
 201. Ewert T, Grill E, Bartholomeyczik S, et al. ICF Core Set for patients with neurological conditions in the acute hospital. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 367–373.
 202. Grill E, Ewert T, Chatterji S, et al. ICF Core Sets development for the acute hospital and early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 361–366.
 203. Grill E, Hermes R, Swoboda W, et al. ICF Core Set for geriatric patients in early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 411–417.
 204. Grill E, Lipp B, Boldt C, et al. Identification of relevant ICF categories by patients with neurological conditions in early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 459–465.
 205. Scheuringer M, Stucki G, Huber EO, et al. ICF Core Set for patients with musculoskeletal conditions in early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 405–410.
 206. Stier-Jarmer M, Grill E, Ewert T, et al. ICF Core Set for patients with neurological conditions in early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 389–395.
 207. Stoll T, Brach M, Huber EO, et al. ICF Core Set for patients with musculoskeletal conditions in the acute hospital. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 381–387.
 208. Aringer M, Stamm TA, Pisetsky DS, et al. ICF core sets: how to specify impairment and function in systemic lupus erythematosus. *Lupus* 2006; 15: 248–253.
 209. Cieza A, Geyh S, Chatterji S, et al. Identification of candidate categories of the International Classification of Functioning Disability and Health (ICF) for a Generic ICF Core Set based on regression modelling. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2006; 6: 36.
 210. Coenen M, Cieza A, Stamm TA, et al. Validation of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) Core Set for rheumatoid arthritis from the patient perspective using focus groups. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2006; 8: R84.
 211. Stucki G, Ustun TB, Melvin J. Applying the ICF for the acute hospital and early post-acute rehabilitation facilities. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 349–352.
 212. Finger M, Cieza A, Stoll T, et al. Identification of physical therapy intervention categories based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: a Delphi exercise. *Phys Ther* 2006; 86: 1203–1220.
 213. Grill E, Stucki G, Scheuringer M, Melvin J. Validation of International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) Core Sets for Early Postacute Rehabilitation Facilities. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2006; 85: 640–649.
 214. Wynia K, Middel B, Van Dijk JP, et al. Broadening the scope on health problems among the chronically neurologically ill with the International Classification of Functioning (ICF). *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 1445–1454.
 215. Kirchnerberger I, Glaessel A, Stucki G, Cieza A. validation of the Comprehensive International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health Core Set for Rheumatoid Arthritis: the perspective of physical therapists. *Phys Ther* 2007; 87: 368–384.
 216. Tschiesner U, Cieza A, Rogers SN, et al. Developing core sets for patients with head and neck cancer based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2007; 264: 1215–1222.
 217. Vieta E, Cieza A, Stucki G, et al. Developing core sets for persons with bipolar disorder based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *Bipolar Disorders* 2007; 9: 16–24.
 218. Moller K. Deafblindness: a challenge for assessment – is the ICF a useful tool? *Int J Audiol* 2003; 42: S140–S142.

219. Rentsch H, Bucher P, Dommen Nyffeler I, et al. The implementation of the 'International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health' (ICF) in daily practice of neurorehabilitation: an interdisciplinary project at the Kantonsspital of Lucerne, Switzerland. *Disabil Rehabil* 2003; 25: 411.
220. Bostrom K, Ahlstrom G. Living with a chronic deteriorating disease: the trajectory with muscular dystrophy over ten years. *Disabil Rehabil* 2004; 26: 1388–1398.
221. Lomax CL, Brown RG, Howard RJ. Measuring disability in patients with neurodegenerative disease using the "Yesterday Interview". *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2004; 19: 1058–1064.
222. Wilder J, Axelsson C, Granlund M. Parents and child interaction: a comparison of parents' perceptions in three groups. *Disabil Rehabil* 2004; 26: 1313–1322.
223. Finn P, Howard R, Kubala R. Unassisted recovery from stuttering: self-perceptions of current speech behavior, attitudes, and feelings. *J Fluency Disord* 2005; 30: 281–305.
224. Heinen MM, Van Achterberg T, Roodbol G, Frederiks CMA. Applying ICF in nursing practice: classifying elements of nursing diagnoses. *Int Nurs Rev* 2005; 52: 304–312.
225. Kjeker I, Dagfinrud H, Slatkowsky-Christensen B, et al. Activity limitations and participation restrictions in women with hand osteoarthritis: patients' descriptions and associations between dimensions of functioning. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2005; 64: 1633–1638.
226. Maeda S, Kita F, Miyawaki T, et al. Assessment of patients with intellectual disability using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health to evaluate dental treatment tolerability. *J Intellect Disabil Res* 2005; 49: 253–259.
227. Mayo NE, Nadeau L, Levesque L, et al. Does the addition of functional status indicators to case-mix adjustment indices improve prediction of hospitalization, institutionalization, and death in the elderly? *Med Care* 2005; 43: 1194–1202.
228. Muo R, Schindler A, Vernero I, et al. Alzheimer's disease-associated disability: an ICF approach. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 1405–1413.
229. Paltamaa J, West H, Sarasoja T, et al. Reliability of physical functioning measures in ambulatory subjects with MS. *Physiother Res Int* 2005; 10: 93–109.
230. Tannenbaum C, Mayo N, Ducharme F. Older women's health priorities and perceptions of care delivery: results of the WOW health survey. *Can Med Assoc J* 2005; 173: 153–159.
231. van Achterberg T, Holleman G, Heijnen-Kaales Y, et al. Using a multidisciplinary classification in nursing: the International Classification of Functioning Disability and Health. *J Adv Nurs* 2005; 49: 432–441.
232. Hendershot G, Placek P, Goodman N. Taming the beast: measuring vision-related disability using the International Classification of Functioning. *J Vis Impair Blind* 2006; Special Suppl: 806–823.
233. Jelsma J, Brauer N, Hahn C, et al. A pilot study to investigate the use of the ICF in documenting levels of function and disability in people living with HIV. *South African J Physiother* 2006; 62: 7–13.
234. Odman P, Oberg B. Effectiveness and expectations of intensive training: a comparison between child and youth rehabilitation and conductive education. *Disabil Rehabil* 2006; 28: 561–570.
235. Petterson I, Tornquist K, Ahlstrom G. The effect of an outdoor powered wheelchair on activity and participation in users with stroke. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol* 2006; 1: 235–243.
236. Pierce CA, Hanks RA. Life satisfaction after traumatic brain injury and the World Health Organization model of disability. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2006; 85: 889–898.
237. van Baar ME, Essink-Bot ML, Oen IMM, et al. Functional outcome after burns: a review. *Burns* 2006; 32: 1–9.
238. Van Echteld I, Cieza A, A B, et al. Identification of the most common problems by patients with ankylosing spondylitis using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *J Rheumatol* 2006; 33: 2475–2483.
239. Wilkie R, Peat G, Thomas E, et al. The Keele Assessment of Participation: a new instrument to measure participation restriction in population studies. Combined qualitative and quantitative examination of its psychometric properties. *Qual Life Res* 2005; 14: 1889–1899.
240. Maart S, Jelsma J, Eide AH, et al. Environmental barriers experienced by urban and rural disabled people in South Africa. *Disabil Soc* 2007; 22: 357–369.
241. Jette AM, Haley SM, Kooyoomjian JT. Are the ICF Activity and Participation dimensions distinct? *J Rehabil Med* 2003; 35: 145–149.
242. Kronk R, Ogonowski J, Rice C, Feldman H. Reliability in assigning ICF codes to children with special health care needs using a developmentally structured interview. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; 27: 977–983.
243. Okochi J, Utsunomiya S, Takahashi T. Health measurement using the ICF: test-retest reliability study of ICF codes and qualifiers in geriatric care. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2005; 3: 46.
244. Stineman MG, Ross RN, Maislin G. Functional status measures for integrating medical and social care. *Int J Integr Care* 2005; 5: e07.
245. Bales ME, Kukafka R, Burkhardt A, Friedman C. Qualitative assessment of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health with respect to the desiderata for controlled medical vocabularies. *Int J Med Inform* 2006; 75: 384–395.
246. Grill E, Mansmann U, Cieza A, Stucki G. Assessing observer agreement when describing and classifying functioning with the International Classification of Functioning. *J Rehabil Med* 2007; 39: 71–76.
247. Uhlig T, Lillemo S, Moe RH, et al. Reliability of the ICF core set for rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2007; 66: 1078–1084.
248. Zochling J, Grill E, Scheuringer M, et al. Identification of health problems in patients with acute inflammatory arthritis, using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2006; 24: 239–246.
249. World Health Organization. WHO business plan for classifications. Geneva: WHO; 2005, p. 1–39.