

Comments on 'Preliminary dietary recommendations for adult spinal cord-injured endurance hand cyclists'

Ankur Sharma^a, Varshini Vadhithala^b, Arun Kumar^{c,d}, Sushma Verma^e and Sushma Narsing Katkuri^{f*}

^aDepartment of Anatomy, School of Medical Sciences and Research, Sharda University, Greater Noida, India

^bDr DY Patil Medical College, Hospital and Research Centre, Dr DY Patil Vidyapeeth (Deemed-to-be-University), Pimpri, Pune, Maharashtra, India

^cFaculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Graphic Era Hill University, Dehradun, India

^dCentre for Promotion of Research, Graphic Era Deemed University, Dehradun, India

^eDepartment of Pharmaceutics, Noida Institute of Engineering & Technology (Pharmacy Institute) Plot No.19, Knowledge Park-II, Greater Noida, India

^fDepartment of Community Medicine, Malla Reddy Institute of Medical Sciences, Malla Reddy Vishwavidyapeeth, Suraram, Hyderabad, India

*Correspondence: katkurisushma@mrvv.edu.in



Dear Editor,

The recent article proposing preliminary dietary recommendations for adult spinal cord-injured endurance hand cyclists offers a timely synthesis of a sparse evidence base and highlights important sport-specific nutritional challenges in this group.¹ We wish to provide a brief methodological commentary to support interpretation of the recommendations and guide future work.

A clear strength is the focus on a well-defined athletic subgroup and the integration of physiological reasoning with empirical studies and position statements. The authors also emphasise that their guidance is preliminary, which appropriately frames the proposed intake ranges as hypotheses to be tested rather than definitive clinical standards.

However, the review methods are described with less detail than is now expected for transparent evidence syntheses. PRISMA 2020 recommends full reporting of search strategies, study selection processes, and study-level limitations so that readers can judge completeness and risk of bias.² In the present article, databases and keywords are listed, but reproducible search strings, a flow of records screened and excluded, and any formal assessment of study quality or certainty are not reported, which limits appraisal of potential selection and publication biases.

Because the work is essentially a narrative review, structured tools such as SANRA can help ensure justification of scope, adequate description of the literature search, and coherent scientific reasoning.³ Here, original studies and position papers are considered together without explicit weighting or explanation of how heterogeneous findings were synthesised. Methodological assessments of narrative synthesis indicate that limited transparency at this stage can introduce subjectivity and selective emphasis in the conclusions, affecting how strongly readers should rely on specific messages.⁴

Finally, the step from heterogeneous and partly indirect evidence to specific carbohydrate and protein dose ranges relies heavily on expert judgement. Frameworks such as GRADE, including its evidence-to-decision components, encourage

explicit separation between rating certainty of evidence and formulating recommendations, particularly when evidence is sparse or indirect.⁵ Using such a framework in future iterations could clarify which elements are strongly supported by data and which should be viewed as consensus-based starting points.

The article offers a useful and clinically relevant narrative synthesis, but its interpretability would be strengthened by more detailed reporting of review methods, formal appraisal of study quality or certainty, and a transparent process for moving from evidence to quantitative recommendations.

CRedit author statement

Ankur Sharma: conceptualisation; writing – original draft; writing – review and editing. **Varshini Vadhithala:** conceptualisation; writing – original draft, writing – review and editing. **Arun Kumar:** writing – original draft, writing – review and editing. **Sushma Verma:** writing – original draft, writing – review and editing. **Sushma Narsing Katkuri:** validation, writing – review and editing.

References

1. Gordon RE, Potgieter S, Havemann-Nel L. Preliminary dietary recommendations for adult spinal cord-injured endurance hand cyclists. *S A J Clin Nutr.* 2025;38(4):197–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16070658.2025.2558210>
2. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2021;134:178–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.03.001>
3. Baethge C, Goldbeck-Wood S, Mertens S. SANRA—a scale for the quality assessment of narrative review articles. *Res Int Peer Rev.* 2019;4(1):5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0064-8>
4. Campbell M, Katikireddi SV, Sowden A, et al. Lack of transparency in reporting narrative synthesis of quantitative data: a methodological assessment of systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2019;105:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.08.019>
5. Prasad M. Introduction to the GRADE tool for rating certainty in evidence and recommendations. *Clin Epidemiol Glob Health.* 2024;25:101484. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cegh.2023.101484>

Received: 6-12-2025 Accepted: 27-01-2026