
Dear Editor:

I am writing concerning a recent article published in JRRD. In the article (Ding et al. Usage of tilt-in-space, recline, and elevation seating functions in natural environment of wheelchair users. J Rehabil Res Dev. 2008; 45(7):973–84), the authors report on other studies that used portable devices to monitor the use of tilt-in-space wheelchairs. As an author of one of the sources quoted in the text, we thought it was important to clarify a misinterpretation of a portion of our work.

On p. 974, the authors write “They reported that data collection failed because of the difficulty of device installation and associated reliability issues.”

However, our data collection system has been reliable in the monitoring of more than 30 research participants using tilt-in-space systems, and this research is ongoing. In fact, data resulting from our monitoring approach have been presented at numerous conferences [1–5] (including the presentation cited in Ding et al. [1]) and, more recently, published in a peer-reviewed journal article [6].

We believe the research we are performing in this field, in concert with the work of others, including Ding et al., is significant and will advance this emerging topic of inquiry. It is all the more important then that the tools, techniques, and outcomes of this work are accurately presented.

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify the report of our work and to acknowledge our colleagues’ efforts.

Respectfully,

Sharon Eve Sonenblum, ScM
NSF Graduate Research Fellow, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA
sharon.sonenblum@coa.gatech.edu
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Dear Editor:


We cited two papers by Ms. Sonenblum and her colleagues (reference 4 in 2006 and 5 in 2005 in her Letter to the Editor) in our JRRD article. Those were the only papers available from them at the time when we wrote our paper and when our paper was accepted for publication. We believe we honestly and accurately reported the results of these two papers. In reference 4, the authors wrote, “Given the many challenges of instrumenting a wheelchair, not all data collection was successful. The data presented here reflects data for subjects for whom the sensor performed accurately over
the course of instrumentation.” In reference 5, the authors wrote, “GPS is only reported for two subjects as the receiver malfunctioned in one case. Time in chair data could not be obtained for subject P14 due to a seat occupancy sensor that was not optimized for the subject’s extremely low weight.” The other papers in Ms. Sonenblum’s list were all published later than the date when our JRRD paper was accepted, and we had no way of knowing the results from these papers and incorporating them into our article.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond to this Letter to the Editor.

Sincerely,

Dan Ding, PhD
Assistant Professor, Department of Rehabilitation Science and Technology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA
dad5@pitt.edu