

## **Response to reviewers**

Thank you for your valuable effort and time spent in reviewing this manuscript. We performed your recommendations and responded to all of them in the main manuscript.

The information on subthreshold vibration is unique and intriguing with potential for stimulating future research and having an impact on clinical practice. Please see the notes on the manuscript and on the required elements noted below for some input.

The greatest limitation is the lack of details on any recommendations for future studies.

Thank you for this valuable comment. I added future recommendation to this manuscript.

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Not fully – This is a review article and state clearly in the title. There are no proposed parameters or guidelines for implementing a treatment with the elderly

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment. I added “ A review to the tilte”. For the proposed parameters, we are conducting a RCT now to find best parameters for subthreshold vibration.

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes, but should also note that this is a review article.

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? yes

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? The background needs some clarification and work on word choice

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification. We edited the introductions according to your valuable recommendations.

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? – No methods are required – This is not a systematic review – more of an informed opinion with review

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? N/A – But conclusion of the review provides strong recommendations to pursue research in this area of vibration

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? N/A – see results – The conclusions appear valid and supported

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? Figures are helpful to summarize the effects of vibration

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? n/a

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? n/a

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification.

11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Ok – citations should fall after the period and immediately after the authors. The volume of citations make it difficult to verify accuracy.

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification. We carefully revised the references.

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? See comments on the manuscript.

3 main issues:

1. Individually cited sources should have a bit more elaboration to inform the reader of the population that was studied in the research at a minimum and also the type of research performs i.e. a RCT

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification. We revised this manuscript according to your valuable recommendations.

2. Some sentence structure and word choice issues that should be revisited to help with the clarity

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification. We revised this manuscript according to your valuable recommendations.

3. Have a clear conclusion of application or suggestions for future research --- it is ready to have a clinical trial with patients or is more work needed

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification. We added future recommendations.

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable?

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification. This manuscript is a literature review.

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

**Response:** Thank you for this valuable comment and clarification. This is a review article that does not include involving human and/or animal experiments.