

Author Responses to Reviewer 1

Concerning the systematic review and meta-analysis entitled: “Effects of promoting physical activity on functional outcomes in patients hospitalized over 48 hours: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials”.

We would like to thank Reviewer 1 for the recommendations and feedback. We appreciate all contributions, which we believe led to improvement of our manuscript. We have revised our manuscript and would like to take the opportunity to resubmit our systematic review and meta-analysis. All changes are highlighted with tracked changes as requested. The point to point responses to the comments are provided below.

REVIEWER 1 RECOMMENDATIONS

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

1. Please unify the abbreviations of e.g., or i.e. throughout the whole paper.

Authors' response:

We thank the reviewer for the useful contributions. We have unified the abbreviations throughout the whole paper.

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

2. Line 21, n = 368, was that a sum of four studies' sample size? Please define.

Authors' response:

We agree that the use of n=368 was unclear. We have now added:

- Abstract, line 23: Out of 23,302 identified studies, we included 4 studies (in total n=368 participants).

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

3. Line 24, define out the abbreviation of ADL.

Authors' response:

We have now written out the abbreviation ADL in the abstract, results and table.

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

4. Line 25, what is community mobility, please define? I am not sure on this, because I am unaware of the community mobility.

Authors' response:

Community mobility is indeed not a very common term. We have now provided the definition in our manuscript:

- Methods, lines 110-112: In this review and meta-analysis, community mobility was defined as 'the ability of a person to purposefully move out of the room in which the person sleeps to another area in a specific time period'.[23]

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

5. Line 79, what does the sentence “Reviewers were not blinded to authors, institutions, or manuscript journals” mean?

Authors’ response:

We understand that this information is confusing and redundant. We have removed the sentence.

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

6. Line 84, you mention the primary outcomes, do you have secondary outcomes?

Authors’ response:

We did use the word ‘primary’ outcomes incorrect. All functional and hospital outcomes were considered equally important. We have removed the term ‘primary’ outcomes.

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

7. Line 93, should be follow-up duration.

Authors’ response:

We have changed the sentence and added ‘duration’.

- Methods, lines 114-117: Two reviewers (JS and NK) used standardized forms to independently extract the following data from each eligible study: study characteristics such as authors, year of publication, setting, type of intervention, and follow-up duration; study population characteristics such as age, gender; and study outcomes.

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

8. Regarding the outcomes description, not use for example, should list all the studied outcomes in the review (Line 84-90)

Authors’ response:

We have now added all functional and hospital outcomes and removed ‘for example’.

- Methods, lines 103-112: Functional outcomes were used to assess the effect of physical activity promotion on (instrumental) activities of daily living. The studies included information on: reported falls, activities of daily living, time spent in different levels of physical activity (time spent lying, sitting, standing, cycling, or walking), community mobility, hospital mobility, and revolutions cycled.[22] In this review and meta-analysis, community mobility was defined as ‘the ability of a person to purposefully move out of the room in which the person sleeps to another area in a specific time period’.[23]

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

9. What is the general physical activity, please define it clearly in the paper. This revision is extremely important.

Authors’ response:

We have now added our definition of general physical activity and general physical activity promoting interventions:

- Methods, lines 59-69: We used the definition of physical activity as provided by Caspersen et al.: ‘physical activity is any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that requires energy expenditure’.[20] We defined general physical activity promoting interventions as non-disease-specific interventions aiming to promote physical activity of patients during their hospital stay, which could be administered to patients with different medical indications without the need for supervision of specialized staff (unsupervised). General physical activity promoting interventions should be applicable to a broad range of patients, interventions

used in specific patient populations were considered specific interventions. In addition, general physical activity promoting interventions should not consist solely of supervised exercises, as these interventions were considered as (physical) exercise therapy rather than general physical activity promoting interventions.[21]

Reviewer 1 recommendation:

10. Line 232, not replicated in the discussion again because we have known it in the results section.

Authors' response:

We agree that the specific results should not be presented again in the discussion section. We have removed the text.