Reviewer’s report

Title: Use of robot technology in passive mobilization of acute hospitalized geriatric medicine patients: a pilot test and feasibility study

Version: 0 Date: 29 Jul 2019

Reviewer: Peter Crome

Reviewer's report:

Report on Paper "use of technology"

This is a well-written paper that with a few adjustments is suitable for publication. However there is an imbalance between the rather positive conclusions about the intervention and the practical difficulties reported by the physiotherapists using the robot.

I have the following comments to make:

Abstract:
Background: Surely a pilot and feasibility study is help design a full RCT and not a "future pilot randomized controlled trial".
Methods:
29: "Recruited" rather than "included: patients.
31: Severe rather than server (this error is repeated further on the paper).
33: Pressure ulcers rather than bedsores.
37: The dates are not necessary.
Results:
40: Confident rather than confidential.
44: Difficult or unwieldy rather than unhandy.
Conclusion:
47. I do not understand the reason why the fact that the robot you used is unsuitable for a RCT. Is there not a role for passive mobilization in some circumstances?
Background:
59: I would use geriatric medicine patients rather than just geriatric.
75: I think up to line 80 could be omitted.
Participants:
98: Were the patients screened systematically? All patients on day 3 for example?
Intervention:
113: Who made the robot?
118: Is it possible to state how the robot learns? Where was the physiotherapist when the 20 repetitions were carried out?
Outcomes and Data collection:
125: I would combine these. What patient data did you collect? What were the diagnoses?
131: What were the questions?
144: Could you include the questionnaire?
151: The "training physiotherapist". Who was this? How many physiotherapists were involved and did they also undertake any other treatments with the patients.
Pilot Test:
I think time spent rather than time spend. Delete regarding.

A study board is mentioned. This should be in the methods or in the declarations.

One could debate below is or below are. I prefer the latter!

Were rather than was.

Wise rather than wisely.

I have not used the word shine being used in this context.

How close is close?

Management:

I do not understand what the statement about the physiotherapist and technical functions means.

Did everybody find this?

Time consuming rather than time spending.

The perspective:

Could this not be shortened? After all this is only a pilot study and not too much can be made of these findings.

Geriatric medicine not geriatric. (and elsewhere).

I think making any conclusions about the effectiveness of this technique is very questionable. You did not test the conclusions reached on line 321.

Again very questionable results. Tone these down.

Feeling nice. Is that how you judge efficacy?

This paragraph could be omitted.
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