

Methodological Inconsistency in Exercise Classification. A Comment on 'A Comparative Study of Whole Body Vibration Training and Pelvic Floor Muscle Training on Women's Stress Urinary Incontinence', Three-Month Follow-Up'

Necmettin Yıldız; M.D.

1 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Faculty of Medicine, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey

Received February 2026; Revised and accepted March 2026

Dear Editor

I read with great interest the aforementioned article, published in your esteemed journal. This study is highly significant as it provides valuable, pioneering insights into the potential role of whole-body vibration (WBV) as a neuromuscular facilitation tool for pelvic floor rehabilitation. However, I would like to highlight a critical methodological inconsistency in the exercise classification presented in Table 1, which may lead to confusion among clinicians and researchers attempting to replicate or build upon this essential protocol.

In Table 1, the authors categorise the first two stages of the intervention as 'static' exercise types. However, a detailed examination of the exercise sets reveals the inclusion of stations 'h' and 'i', which the text explicitly defines as 'dynamic bridging' and 'dynamic lunge', respectively. By physiological definition, a static (isometric) exercise involves muscle contraction without a change in joint angle, whereas a dynamic exercise involves movement through a range of motion.

If stations 'h' and 'i' were performed as 'static holds' (i.e. maintaining a position without movement) during the initial sessions to ensure tissue adaptation, this should have been explicitly stated. If they were performed dynamically, labelling the entire phase as 'static' would be inaccurate from a methodological

perspective. The neuromuscular demands and the stability of the pelvic floor required differ substantially between static and dynamic loading on a vibrating platform.

Clarifying this nomenclature is essential for establishing reproducible, standardised WBV protocols in urogynaecological rehabilitation. Addressing this nuance would further enhance the robust scientific framework that this study has already provided.

Conflict of Interests

Authors have no conflict of interests.

References

1. Farzinmehr A, Moezy A, Koohpayehzadeh J, Kashanian M. A Comparative Study of Whole Body Vibration Training and Pelvic Floor Muscle Training on Women's Stress Urinary Incontinence: Three-Month Follow-Up. J Family Reprod Health. 2015;9(4):147-54.

Citation: Yıldız N. Methodological Inconsistency in Exercise Classification. A Comment on 'A Comparative Study of Whole Body Vibration Training and Pelvic Floor Muscle Training on Women's Stress Urinary Incontinence', Three-Month Follow-Up'. J Family Reprod Health 2026; 20(1): 83.

Correspondence:

Dr. Necmettin Yıldız

Email: necmi74tr@hotmail.com



Copyright © 2026 Tehran University of Medical Sciences. Published by Tehran University of Medical Sciences.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Noncommercial uses of the work are permitted, provided the original work is properly cited.