# **NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH NOTES**

ISSN: 2576-828X

# **OPEN ACCESS | SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**

# Current status of post-traumatic brain injury rehabilitation care in LMI Southeast Asian Countries: A mini systematic review

Juwei Ong <sup>1</sup>, Alina Arulsamy <sup>2,\*</sup> and Mohd. Farooq Shaikh <sup>2</sup>

Received: 9 June 2022; Accepted: 23 September 2022; Published: 24 November 2022

Edited by: Norshariza Nordin (Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia)

**Reviewed by:** Kamalanathan Palaniandy (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia); Raghuveer Raghumahanti (The Gandhi Institute of Technology and Management, India) <a href="https://doi.org/10.31117/neuroscirn.v5i4.169">https://doi.org/10.31117/neuroscirn.v5i4.169</a>

Keywords: post-injury care; TBI; rehabilitation; quality of life; LMIC

©2022 by Ong *et al.* for use and distribution according to the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC 4.0) license (<a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/">https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/</a>), which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## **Supplementary Table S1**

Table S1: Quality analysis of prospective cohort studies using the Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies by The Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP).

	Questions	Mazlan		Urbenjaphol		Siti Fatahiyah	
		et al		et al (2009)		& Hanapiah	
		(2021)				(2017)	
A) Selection	Q1	1	Strong	1	Strong	1	Strong
bias	Q2	1		1		1	
B) Study	Q1	3	Moderate	5	Moderate	7	Moderate
design							
C)	Q1	2	Strong	2	Strong	3	Moderate
Confounders	Q2	-		-		3	
D) Blinding	Q1	2	Moderate	2	Moderate	3	Weak
	Q2	3		3		3	
E) Data	Q1	1	Strong	1	Strong	1	Moderate
collection	Q2	1		1		3	
method							

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Jeffrey Cheah School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Monash University Malaysia, Bandar Sunway, 47500 Subang Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Neuropharmacology Research Laboratory, Jeffrey Cheah School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Monash University Malaysia, Bandar Sunway, 47500 Subang Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia.

<sup>\*</sup> Correspondence: alina.arulsamy@monash.edu; Tel.: +603 5514 6272

F)	Q1	1	Moderate	1	Strong	3	Weak
Withdrawals	Q2	2		1		4	
and dropouts							
G)	Q1	1	-	1	-	4	-
Intervention	Q2	1		1		3	
integrity	Q3	5		5		6	
H) Analyses	Q1	2	-	2	-	1	-
	Q2	2		2		1	
	Q3	1		1		3	
	Q4	2		2		3	
Final Rating			Strong		Strong		Moderate

# **EPHPP Questions**

#### A) SELECTION BIAS

- (Q1) Are the individuals selected to participate in the study likely to be representative of the target population?
- 1 Very likely 2 Somewhat likely 3 Not likely 4 Can't tell
- (Q2) What percentage of selected individuals agreed to participate?
- $1\ 80$  100% agreement  $\ 2\ 60-79\%$  agreement  $\ 3$  less than 60% agreement  $\ 4$  Not applicable 5 Can't tell

## **B) STUDY DESIGN**

Indicate the study design

- 1 Randomized controlled trial 2 Controlled clinical trial 3 Cohort analytic
- 4 Case-control 5 Cohort (one group pre + post) 6 Interrupted time series

7 Other specify 8 Can't tell

## C) CONFOUNDERS

- (Q1) Were there important differences between groups prior to the intervention?
- 1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell
- (Q2) If yes, indicate the percentage of relevant confounders that were controlled (either in the design (e.g. stratification, matching) or analysis)?
- 180 100% (most) 260 79% (some) 3 Less than 60% (few or none) 4 Can't Tell

#### D) BLINDING

(Q1) Was (were) the outcome assessor(s) aware of the intervention or exposure status of participants? 1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell (Q2) Were the study participants aware of the research question? 3 Can't tell 1 Yes 2 No E) DATA COLLECTION METHOD (Q1) Were data collection tools shown to be valid? 1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell (Q2) Were data collection tools shown to be reliable? 1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell F) WITHDRAWALS AND DROP-OUTS (Q1) Were withdrawals and drop-outs reported in terms of numbers and/or reasons per group? 1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell 4 Not Applicable (Q2) Indicate the percentage of participants completing the study. (If the percentage differs by groups, record the lowest). 1 80 -100% 2 60 - 79% 3 less than 60% 4 Can't tell 5 Not Applicable **G) INTERVENTION INTEGRITY** (Q1) What percentage of participants received the allocated intervention or exposure of interest? 2 60 - 79% 1 80 -100% 3 less than 60% 4 Can't tell (Q2) Was the consistency of the intervention measured? 1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell (Q3) Is it likely that subjects received an unintended intervention (contamination or co-intervention) that may influence the results? 4 Yes 6 Can't tell 5 No H) ANALYSES (Q1) Indicate the unit of allocation 1 community 2 organization/institution 3 practice/office individual (Q2) Indicate the unit of analysis (circle one) 1 community 2 organization/institution 3 practice/office individual (Q3) Are the statistical methods appropriate for the study design?

1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell

(Q4) Is the analysis performed by intervention allocation status (i.e. intention to treat) rather than the actual intervention received?

1 Yes 2 No 3 Can't tell