

Review of: "The Effectiveness of Telerehabilitation in Improving Balance Control Among Older Adults: A Systematic Review & Meta Analyses"

Stephanopoulos Kofi Junior Osei¹

¹ University of Ghana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for sharing your work with us. Aged interventions are crucial in mitigating adverse outcomes such as falls and associated complications.

Title/Abstract

I believe your study is a protocol. Kindly make that clear in your title. Also, you should modify your abstract so the study will reflect the protocol phase it is currently in. Based on the meta-analysis, this is a completed review, but the body of the manuscript suggests otherwise.

Background

"Studies have been conducted regarding the effectiveness of telerehabilitation in improving balance but have shown inconsistent results." This statement should at least be backed with some citations, and those studies indicating conflicting results should be referenced.

Your background should also highlight whether or not other systematic reviews have been conducted in this area. If so, why are you also conducting a systematic review? Reasons could be that other systematic reviews did not target your population of interest, or did not focus on your outcomes, or presented outdated information, etc. Additionally, you have to highlight why you are performing a systematic review. Reasons could be that you would like to comprehensively evaluate the effects of telerehab among your population, explain the variations of effect in the intervention, etc.

Methods

In your inclusion criteria under the interventions sub-heading, you should only indicate the intervention and possible explanations of it, not the study type. You have already indicated study types in another sub-heading. Your PICO inclusion criteria are enough to establish the eligibility criteria. I do not think you need an extra sub-heading for eligibility criteria. I believe you must provide justification for excluding unpublished studies. Usually, studies with significant results are published compared to those without. If you're looking to reduce publication bias and its effect on your results, then you should consider published and unpublished studies.

"This systematic review will consider studies that include balance control and functional balance as its primary outcomes and fall risk and fear of falling as its secondary outcomes." This statement rather stiffens your inclusion criteria.

Essentially, studies that reported balance control and functional balance as secondary outcomes may be excluded, and studies with risk of fall as a secondary outcome may be excluded. I believe the sentence should read, "The primary outcomes of this review are A, B, and C. D and E are considered as secondary outcomes for the current review." I believe you should revisit the JBI critical appraisal tools selected and explain how they will be applied. "The template used for the table will be derived from a previously done systematic review." Please include a citation. The I² statistic determines how much of the variance could be explained by variation in the true population effects, not simple between-study variance.

I understand that this is a BSc thesis and commend the early career researchers on their hard work. Kindly seek more help from supervisors on improving this manuscript. All the best in your study completion, and congrats in advance.