

Reviewer's report

Title: The feasibility of whole body vibration in institutionalised elderly persons and its influence on muscle performance, balance and mobility: a randomised controlled trial.

Version: 3 Date: 3 October 2005

Reviewer: Vance Berger

Reviewer's report:

I think the revision looks much improved, and I have only one more question, plus one more comment. First, the question. Was the randomization simultaneous because all subjects were together at the same time and in the same place, and randomized together at the same time? Or does this mean only that the allocation sequence was prepared all at the same time, but patients were enrolled sequentially? If the former, then this would effectively eliminate the selection bias that would still be a concern in the latter case (in which case it would have to be investigated). Even in the former case, the elimination of selection bias and the reason why should be stated explicitly. Finally, the comment. The exclusions after randomization are still violations of the ITT approach, and data should be imputed for these missing data, probably using the worst rank approach. See Lachin JM, Worst-rank score analysis with informatively missing observations in clinical trials, CONTROL CLIN TRIALS 20 (5): 408-422 OCT 1999 and Lachin JM, Statistical considerations in the intent-to-treat principle, CONTROL CLIN TRIALS 21 (3): 167-189 JUN 2000.