# Article information:

Repetitive peripheral magnetic stimulation for impairment and disability in people after stroke - PubMed
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36169558/>

# Article summary:

1. Repetitive peripheral magnetic stimulation (rPMS) is a non-invasive treatment method that can improve motor function in people with physical impairment after stroke.

2. The effectiveness and safety of rPMS for people after stroke remain uncertain, as there is insufficient evidence to draw any conclusions about its routine use.

3. Additional trials with large sample sizes are needed to provide robust evidence for the use of rPMS after stroke.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

这篇文章是一篇关于脑卒中后人群中重复外周磁刺激（rPMS）对功能障碍和残疾的影响的综述。文章指出，虽然rPMS已被证明可以改善日常生活活动和功能能力，但对于脑卒中后人群来说，这种干预的有效性和安全性仍然不确定。该综述包括了四个试验，涉及139名参与者。然而，作者得出的结论是目前没有足够的证据支持在脑卒中后人群中常规使用rPMS。

从批判性分析的角度来看，这篇文章存在以下几个问题：

1. 潜在偏见及其来源：文章未提及作者是否有任何潜在的利益冲突或资金来源。这可能导致作者在选择、解释和报道研究结果时存在偏见。

2. 片面报道：文章只包括了四个试验，并且只有两个试验提供了足够的数据进行荟萃分析。由于样本量较小，作者认为相关证据的可靠性较低。然而，他们并未探讨为什么只有很少数量的试验可用，并且没有讨论可能存在的发表偏倚或选择性报道的问题。

3. 缺失的考虑点：文章未提及对于脑卒中后人群来说，rPMS可能存在的潜在风险或副作用。这是一个重要的考虑因素，特别是在评估干预措施的安全性时。

4. 所提出主张的缺失证据：尽管作者得出结论认为目前没有足够的证据支持常规使用rPMS，但他们并未详细讨论为什么现有研究结果不支持该干预措施。他们没有提供关于研究设计、方法学质量或其他可能解释研究结果不一致的因素的深入分析。

5. 未探索的反驳：文章未提及任何可能与其结论相悖或对其结论产生质疑的观点或研究结果。这种片面性可能导致读者无法全面了解该领域中不同观点和证据之间的辩论。

总体而言，这篇文章在描述和评估rPMS对脑卒中后人群功能障碍和残疾的影响时存在一些偏见和局限性。进一步的研究需要更大样本量，并且应该更全面地考虑潜在的风险和副作用，以提供更可靠的证据来支持或反驳rPMS在脑卒中后人群中的应用。

# Topics for further research:

* Potential conflicts of interest and funding sources
* Limited number of included trials and potential publication bias
* Potential risks and side effects of rPMS in stroke survivors
* Lack of discussion on why existing studies do not support the intervention
* Unexplored opposing viewpoints or contradictory research findings
* Need for larger sample sizes and comprehensive consideration of potential risks and benefits in future research.
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