**Analysis of the 2015 Loras, et al., study**

In Medical Exercise Therapy for Treating Musculoskeletal Pain: A Narrative Review of Results from Randomized Controlled Trials with a Theoretical Perspective, authors Loras, Osteras, Torstensen and Osteras (2015) show relevance, significance, fairness, clarity, accuracy, and precision.

Relevance can be seen in terms of how the writers were able to provide how relevant medical exercise therapy is in managing musculoskeletal pain.  The authors enumerated in pages 183 to 184, the qualities of medical exercise therapy, its application, and efficiency as a musculoskeletal therapy.  Significance can also be noted in terms of how the authors were able to highlight in the first paragraph how pain associated with musculoskeletal issues can have a significant impact on the physiology and mental state of an individual. They were able to show the basic features of MET in page 183 in terms of its qualities which can promote better musculoskeletal pain management.  This central idea is the most relevant to the problem as MET is known to provide physiological and eventually mental health management for pain.  The author states that “the physiotherapist is present in the exercise room supervising, while the patient(s) is treated with graded exercise therapy” (Loras, et al., 2015). Fairness is about treating the subject and topic from an objective perspective.  Such fairness is also exercised in this paper as the authors were objective in their approach throughout the study especially in the final paragraph.  They considered numerous peer-reviewed studies as can be noted in the numerous literature reviewed by the authors.  They did not include their feelings on the subject matter and they do not have a vested interest in the study.  They are not being paid by companies or individuals to conduct the study.  Clarity is generally present in the paper as the authors were able to provide sufficient explanation, definition, and elaboration on medical exercise therapy, its features as a musculoskeletal pain intervention and the different studies explaining and supporting MET’s efficacy as an intervention.  The clarity is most apparent in the introduction portion where the writers cited statistics to support their statements on musculoskeletal conditions, exercise therapy, as well as gaps in the knowledge about interventions for such musculoskeletal issues. Accuracy can also be noted in the authors’ statements and explanations related to MET.  The authors provided numerous literature to support data on MET while also providing details on the clinical efficacy of this therapy in relation to musculoskeletal issues.  It is possible to check the author’s statements through the supportive figures and literature where specific citations are indicated for the data presented.  There is also precision in the paper as the link between musculoskeletal conditions and MET is clearly explained and laid out by the authors in the first three pages of the paper.

Depth is lacking as the authors did not address sufficiently the complexities of the topic. The authors also did not study the topic in-depth and were at times repetitive in their details which did not add depth to the most significant aspects of the study.  There is also no breadth in the study as the arguments for associating MET with musculoskeletal pain intervention is not well reasoned and there is only one theory presented to support the link.  There is a need to consider other theories and perspectives on this topic.  Other perspectives can help reconcile possible conflicts.  As for logic, there is no logic in some parts of the topic. There are some parts of the discussion which do not seem to come from the previous ideas presented.  There is lack of mutual support in ideas and there are some parts which do not make sense.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this critique or analysis tells me that this topic is very much clear, relevant, significant, fair, and precise.  The details it provides on musculoskeletal issues and MET are very much important details which help the reader understand the topic.  This study however has some illogical parts and is lacking in depth and breadth in some aspects.  Still in general, this study points out important details about MET which can be useful in relieving musculoskeletal pain.  However, there are some improvements which can be made on the paper in order to improve its readability as well as utility as a peer-reviewed research.

**Reflection**

As I reflect upon my process of analyzing this article, I realize that it is difficult to fulfill all the nine universal intellectual standards. One may be able to fulfill some of the standards, but it is difficult to fulfill all, especially as different readers may assess some of the standards in different ways.  What may be clear to one may not be clear to others, for instance and what may be logical to some may not be to others.  In reflecting on my process of analyzing this article, I also realized that in later writing a paper, I should take serious note of these standards to guide me.
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