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

Jumes Lira[1]

1 Universidade de São Paulo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Firstly, I would like to say it's a pleasure to review this study. Although the proposal is in the infinitive (likely as a protocol registration proposal), the study is interesting and brings good perspectives. I will leave comments on each of the sections to help improve the review and meta-analysis.

Introduction:

 It is well-written (with clarity and conciseness) and has good logical connectivity. I suggest only improving the description of the objective. For example: "Is there effectiveness of telerehabilitation exercises in improving both static and dynamic balance in older adults?"

Question Review:

The study question is interesting, but its formulation can be improved (as mentioned above). For example, "Is there effectiveness of telerehabilitation exercises in improving both static and dynamic balance in older adults?"

Inclusion Criteria:

 It is clear and provides strong justification for the term used (effectiveness), although only RCTs are considered in this study.

Intervention:

This section could be improved. As a suggestion, the authors could provide examples of the physical exercises considered within the scope of telerehabilitation.

Comparator: Ok

Outcomes:

The section provides definitions of the outcomes. However, the term "Functional Balance" is not clear. At times, the terms

"static balance" and "dynamic balance" are also used. It's important to define the appropriate term and use them in parallel throughout the text.

Types of Study: Ok

Methods:

The section is well-aligned. However, in the search strategy, it would be interesting to add the search strategy used (e.g., PICOS, PICO, or SPIDER), incorporating the respective terms into their respective acronyms. Additionally, how will potential duplicates be handled since PUBMED and GOOGLE SCHOLAR may yield identical articles?

In the eligibility criteria section, the authors can use the parallelism mentioned for the terms 'static and dynamic balance. The same can be done in the outcomes section.

In the assessment of risk of bias section, the authors could explain why they did not request data from the authors of the studies, if necessary. This data could be important for the analysis.

In the Data Synthesis and Analysis section, the authors could provide a clearer explanation of how they will address sensitivity to small or heterogeneous studies in the absence of individual data (which will not be requested), given that random effects will be used. Additionally, random effects assume certain distributions for the effects that may not always be appropriate for the entire dataset. Therefore, the authors could explain in more detail how this will be addressed.

Furthermore, no moderator is proposed. This would be important since variables such as volume, intensity, frequency, and type of physical exercises can directly affect the proposed primary outcome.