PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1: Title page — “Mini Systematic Review”
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Page 1: Abstract section
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 1-2: Section 1. Introduction (paragraphs 1–3)
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 1-2: Section 1. Introduction, final paragraph (objective to critically evaluate BW in PD)
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Page 3: Section 2.1 Eligibility Criteria
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Page 3: Section 2.2 Search Strategy (databases listed, last search July 28, 2025)
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Page 3: Section 2.2 Search Strategy (keywords and Boolean operators)
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 3-4: Section 2.3 Selection of Articles (screening, duplicates, reviewers)
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 4: Section 2.5 Data Extraction (procedures for extracting variables)
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Page 4: Section 2.5 Data Extraction (outcomes: gait, balance, motor symptoms)
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Page 4: Section 2.5 Data Extraction

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			(participant/intervention details)
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 12-13: Section 3.2 Risk-of-bias in Studies (PEDro scale)
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Page 7-10: Section 3.1.1–3.1.7 Results of Individual Studies (β, OR, p-values, correlations)
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Page 5: Section 2.6 Synthesis Methods (qualitative narrative approach)
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Page 5: Section 2.6 Synthesis Methods (data extracted into structured tables; no statistical conversions or imputations performed)
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Page 5,7,11: Section 2.6 & Tables (Table 1, Table 2, Table 3 structure results)
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Page 5: Section 2.6 Synthesis Methods (qualitative narrative synthesis due to heterogeneity of designs, interventions, and outcomes; meta-analysis not feasible)
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Page 5,14,15: Section 2.6 & 3.3 GRADE (heterogeneity acknowledged, differences in design, measures, sample sizes)
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Page 5: Section 2.6 Synthesis Methods (not conducted due to narrative synthesis

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			approach)
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Page 12-13: Section 3.2 Risk-of-bias (publication bias considered, no evidence found)
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Page 14-15: Section 3.3 Assessment of quality of evidence (GRADE)
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Page 6: Section 3.1 Study Selection (n=73 → 9 included, PRISMA flow referenced)
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Page 6: Section 3.1 Study Selection (duplicates, non-eligible, full-text missing)
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Page 7-11: Section 3.1.1–3.1.7 Results of Individual Studies and Table 2, Table 3
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Page 12-13: Section 3.2 Risk-of-bias in Studies and Table 5
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Page 7-10: Section 3.1.1–3.1.7 (summary statistics and outcome associations)
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Page 14-15: Section 3.3 Assessment of quality of evidence
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Page 5,13: No meta-analysis performed (stated in Section 2.6 & 3.3)
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Page 5,13: Section 2.6 & 3.3 (study design, measures, sample size)

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Page 5: Not conducted – a qualitative narrative synthesis was performed due to heterogeneity of study designs, interventions, and outcome measures; all studies were summarized without exclusion or weighting adjustments.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Page 12-13: Section 3.2 Risk-of-bias in Studies (mentioned absence of publication bias)
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Page 13-14: Section 3.3 Assessment of quality of evidence (GRADE tables)
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Page 15-18: Section 4 Discussion (interpretation of BW effects)
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Page 18-19: Section 5 Limitations (quality, small samples, heterogeneity)
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Page 18-19: Section 5 Limitations (not registered, few RCTs, no long follow-up)
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Page 15-19: Section 4 & 5 (clinical implications, need for RCTs)
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Page 19: Registration (not registered)
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Page 19: Registration (no protocol prepared)
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Not applicable

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 19: Medical University of Gdansk
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 19: (authors declare no conflicts)
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Page 19: (data available via listed databases)

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.
This work is licensed under CC BY 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/