# Article information:

确定中风幸存者功能评估措施中功能、残疾和健康国际分类的类别：系统评价 - PubMed  
<http://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov.hnucm.opac.vip/30451028/>

# Article summary:

1. 本研究通过系统评价确定了与巴西葡萄牙语验证的功能评估工具测量相关的国际功能、残疾和健康分类类别。

2. 研究发现，功能独立性测量涉及更多与国际功能、残疾和健康分类相关的概念，因此在评估中风后功能能力时更为适用。

3. 这些研究结果有助于指导卫生专业人员选择最合适的评估工具，并促进临床实践和公共卫生服务中使用国际功能、残疾和健康类别。

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

对于上述文章的详细批判性分析，以下是一些可能的观点和问题：

1. 潜在偏见及其来源：文章没有明确提及作者的潜在利益冲突或研究资助来源。这可能导致潜在的偏见，因为作者可能有与评估工具相关的利益关系。

2. 片面报道：文章只选择了六篇研究进行综述，而忽略了其他可能存在的相关研究。这种选择性报道可能导致对整个领域的理解不完整。

3. 无根据的主张：文章声称功能独立性测量与国际功能、残疾和健康分类有更多关联，但没有提供足够的证据来支持这一主张。缺乏具体数据和分析使得读者难以确定该主张是否可靠。

4. 缺失的考虑点：文章没有讨论评估工具本身的可靠性和有效性。这是一个重要的考虑因素，因为如果评估工具本身不准确或不可靠，那么与国际功能、残疾和健康分类之间建立联系就变得毫无意义。

5. 所提出主张的缺失证据：尽管文章声称功能独立性测量与国际功能、残疾和健康分类有更多关联，但没有提供具体的研究结果或数据来支持这一主张。缺乏实证证据使得读者难以相信该主张的可靠性。

6. 未探索的反驳：文章没有探讨其他可能存在的评估工具与国际功能、残疾和健康分类之间的联系。这种片面性可能导致对整个领域的理解不完整，并忽略了其他可能有价值的观点和证据。

7. 宣传内容：文章中存在一些宣传性语言，如将功能独立性测量描述为与国际功能、残疾和健康分类最相关的评估工具。这种宣传性语言可能会影响读者对该主张的客观判断。

综上所述，上述文章在提供关于中风幸存者功能评估措施中功能、残疾和健康国际分类类别方面存在一些潜在问题。读者应保持批判思维，并进一步考虑其他相关研究和证据来获得更全面和准确的信息。

# Topics for further research:

* Potential bias and conflicts of interest: The article does not mention the author's potential conflicts of interest or sources of research funding. This could lead to potential bias as the author may have vested interests related to the assessment tool being evaluated.
* One-sided reporting: The article only selects six studies for review
* while ignoring other potentially relevant research. This selective reporting may result in an incomplete understanding of the entire field.
* Unsubstantiated claims: The article claims that functional independence measures have more associations with the International Classification of Functioning
* Disability
* and Health
* but does not provide sufficient evidence to support this claim. The lack of specific data and analysis makes it difficult for readers to determine the reliability of this claim.
* Missing considerations: The article does not discuss the reliability and validity of the assessment tool itself. This is an important consideration because if the assessment tool itself is inaccurate or unreliable
* establishing a connection with the International Classification of Functioning
* Disability
* and Health becomes meaningless.
* Lack of evidence for the proposed claims: Despite claiming that functional independence measures have more associations with the International Classification of Functioning
* Disability
* and Health
* the article does not provide specific research findings or data to support this claim. The lack of empirical evidence makes it difficult for readers to believe in the reliability of this claim.
* Unexplored counterarguments: The article does not explore other possible connections between assessment tools and the International Classification of Functioning
* Disability
* and Health. This one-sidedness may result in an incomplete understanding of the entire field and overlook other potentially valuable perspectives and evidence.
* Promotional content: The article contains some promotional language
* such as describing functional independence measures as the most relevant assessment tool to the International Classification of Functioning
* Disability
* and Health. This promotional language may influence readers' objective judgment of this claim.
  In conclusion
* the above article has some potential issues in providing information about functional assessment measures in stroke survivors in relation to the International Classification of Functioning
* Disability
* and Health. Readers should maintain a critical mindset and consider other relevant research and evidence for a more comprehensive and accurate understanding.
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