

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Comments on Aydin et al: The effectiveness of dry needling and exercise therapy in patients with dizziness caused by cervical myofascial pain syndrome : a prospective randomized clinical study.

Reference:

De Hertogh Willem, Vereeck Luc, De Vestel Charlotte, Van Rompaey Vincent, Castien René.- Comments on Aydin et al: The effectiveness of dry needling and exercise therapy in patients with dizziness caused by cervical myofascial pain syndrome : a prospective randomized clinical study. Pain medicine - ISSN 1526-2375 - 21:7(2020), p. 1510-1510 Full text (Publisher's DOI): https://doi.org/10.1093/PM/PNAA119 To cite this reference: https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1679860151162165141

uantwerpen.be

Institutional repository IRUA

Comments on Aydin et al: The effectiveness of dry needling and exercise therapy in patients with dizziness caused by cervical myofascial pain syndrome; a prospective randomized clinical study.

Dear Editor,

After reading the abovementioned article some questions arose which may affect the final conclusions. We would like to ask the authors for some clarifications on the following aspects:

Regarding the presentation of the results and applied statistics:

The authors focus on intra group differences. Both groups improve on all outcome measures. Concerning the inter group differences it is hard to match and interpret the information in the text for instance with the information displayed in table 1 and 4. What do the numbers in the tables represent? Between group differences, the most important results of a randomized clinical trial, are hardly reported. Based on the provided means and standard deviations in the text, we reanalysed their data. We found that both groups hardly differ in time. Using a comparison of means calculator, we compared the reported means and standard deviations and found that both groups only differ on the intensity of the dizziness after 1 month. All other p-values were above 0,05. Was the reported ANOVA a two way ANOVA, taking into account the group and time effects?

Additionally, why was there no trial registration number and no definition of a primary outcome measure?

Regarding the selection and randomisation of participants:

In total 61 participants were included. The recruitment, selection and randomisation of these participants are not clearly described. They were volunteers, but were they recruited via advertisements, in a hospital setting or other?

With these considerations we wonder if the conclusion that dry needling and exercise is more effective than exercise therapy alone is still appropriate?

Hopefully, the authors will elucidate our concerns.

Willem De Hertogh, PT, PhD, Antwerp, Belgium; willem.dehertogh@uantwerpen.be

Luc Vereeck, PT, PhD, Antwerp, Belgium; <u>luc.vereeck@uantwerpen.be</u>

Charlotte De Vestel, PT, MSc, Antwerp, Belgium; <u>charlotte.devestel@uantwerpen.be</u>

Vincent Van Rompaey, MD, PhD, Antwerp, Belgium; vincent.vanrompaey@uantwerpen.be

René Castien, PT, PhD, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; r.castien@amsterdamumc.nl