

table (2)

Domain	Risk of Bias	Supporting Comment
1. Bias due to confounding	Moderate	Baseline differences were present in two shoulder and hip movements. Mitigated by the use of ANCOVA (adjusting for baseline values) and sensitivity analyses (change scores). No control group.
2. Bias in selection of participants into the study	Low	Clear eligibility criteria. Participants were allocated according to the usual practice in the community program (non-randomized but no evidence of differential selection).
3. Bias in classification of interventions	Low	Interventions were clearly defined (dynamic with stick vs. static on mat) and intensity was objectively monitored with the PERFLEX scale.
4. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	Low	Standardized protocol (3 sessions/week for 16 weeks). Intensity was controlled and similar between groups.
5. Bias due to missing data	Low	Analysis based on complete pairs. Transparent correction of four typing errors in hip extension data, documented in Methods.
6. Bias in measurement of outcomes	Low	Standardized goniometry according to the LABIFIE protocol, performed by a trained assessor under similar conditions at pre- and post-test.
7. Bias in selection of the reported result	Low	All pre-specified primary outcomes were reported. No evidence of selective reporting.