Table A for Final Exam:

Table 4. Intercorrelations Among Residualized Change Variables (N = 26)

Measure	1	2	3	4	5
1. PTSD Checklist	—	.71**	.50**	−.27	−.48*
2. Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale		—	.53**	−.24	−.39
3. Beck Depression Inventory–II			—	−.43*	−.40*
4. COPM–Performance				—	.65**
5. COPM–Satisfaction					—

Note. COPM = Canadian Occupational Performance Measure; PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Reference: Speicher, S. M., Walter, K. H., & Chard, K. M. (2014). Interdisciplinary residential treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury: Effects on symptom severity and occupational performance and satisfaction. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 68*(4), 412-421. https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2014.011304

Table B for Final Exam:

Baseline Characteristics of Studied Women

Characteristics	Controls (30)	Cases (60)	t	p
Age (years)	54.6±3.79	55.5±4.35	−0.964	0.338
BMI (kg/m²)	23.01±1.21	29.73±3.33	−13.676	< 0.001
Waist circumference (cm)	76.53±1.87	99.45±11.04	−15.639	< 0.001
Total cholesterol (mmol/L)	6.29±0.89	6.52±0.75	−1.298	0.198
HDL-c (mmol/L)	1.67±0.32	1.43±0.29	3.573	0.001
LDL-c (mmol/L)	4.29±0.60	4.47±0.80	−1.105	0.272
Triglycerides (mmol/L)	1.38±0.47	1.76±0.64	−3.191	0.005
Lipoprotein (a) (g/L)	0.21±0.19	0.23±0.23	−0.589	0.583
HsCRP (mg/L)	0.74±0.27	2.01±1.45	−6.582	< 0.001

BMI, body mass index; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-c, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HsCRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein.

Reference: Klisic, A. N., Vasiljevic, N. D., Simic, T. P., Djukic, T. I., Maksimovic, M. Z., & Matic, M. G. (2014). Association between c-reactive protein, anthropometric and lipid parameters among healthy normal weight and overweight postmenopausal women in Montenegro, *Lab Medicine, 45*(1), 12-16. https://doi.org/10.1309/LMI6I2RN7AMPEUUL

Table C for Final Exam:

Table 2. Completeness of PU documentation in both formats			
PU data elements	**E-recording (n=43)**	**Paper recording (n=39)**	**Significance (p value)**
Descriptions:			
Location	39 (91%)	32 (82%)	0.58
Grade	38 (88%)	28 (72%)	0.02
Size	34 (79%)	19 (49%)	<0.001
Risk assessment	35 (81%)	17 (44%)	0.03
Preventive devices:			
Devices	31 (72%)	21 (54%)	0.04
Repositioning	40 (93%)	34 (87%)	0.13

Note: PU = pressure ulcer
Level of significance: alpha = 0.05

Reference: Tubaishat, A., Tawalbeh, L. I., Azzam, M. A., AlBashtawy, M., & Batiha, A. (2015). Electronic versus paper records: Documentation of pressure ulcer data. *British Journal of Nursing, 24*(6), S30-S37. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2015.24.Sup6.S30