

Review of: "A Study to Assess the Effect of Pelvic Floor Muscle Strengthening Exercises on Urinary Incontinence in Patients with Cervical Cancer Undergoing Radiation Therapy at a Tertiary Cancer Centre"

Taheri Morteza¹

¹ University of Tehran

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

consider the following points:

The work provides a comprehensive overview of the study, outlining the objectives, methods, results, and conclusion.

However, there are several points that could be criticized and improved:

1. Sampling and Design: The study's use of non-probability convenience sampling and a quasi-experimental one-group pre-post design raises concerns about the generalizability of the findings. The lack of a control group makes it difficult to attribute the observed effects solely to the intervention.
2. Intervention Description: The article provides a detailed description of the intervention, which is helpful. However, it would be beneficial to include information about the qualifications of those administering the intervention, as well as any potential biases that may have influenced the results.
3. Statistical Analysis: While the article mentions the statistical tests used, it lacks detail about the specific variables analyzed and the rationale for choosing these particular tests. Providing more information about the statistical analysis would enhance the abstract's clarity and transparency.
4. Results Presentation: The article presents the results in a clear and concise manner, but it could benefit from including effect sizes or confidence intervals to better convey the magnitude of the observed changes.
5. Completion Rate: The fact that only 43 out of 45 participants completed the intervention and follow-up is a significant limitation that should be addressed. The reasons for dropout and how this might have impacted the results should be discussed.
6. Quality of Evidence: While the article states that the research hypothesis was accepted and the intervention was statistically significant, it does not provide information about potential limitations, such as the potential for bias or confounding factors.
7. Generalizability: The article could benefit from a discussion of the generalizability of the findings to other populations and settings, as well as the potential for the intervention to be applied in clinical practice.

In conclusion, while the article provides a thorough summary of the study, there are areas that could be strengthened to enhance the clarity, transparency, and applicability of the findings.