

REFERENCES

1. Novak I, McIntyre S, Morgan C, et al. A systematic review of interventions for children with cerebral palsy: state of the evidence. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2013; **55**: 885–910.
2. GRADE Working Group. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2004; **328**: 1–8.
3. Novak I, McIntyre S. The effect of education on with workplace supports on practitioners' evidence-based practice knowledge and implementation behaviours. *Aust Occup Ther J* 2010; **57**: 386–93.
4. Dalkey N, Helmer O. An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Manage Sci* 1963; **9**: 458–67.

Neurodevelopmental therapy – a popular approach

SARAH CAPELOVITCH

European Bobath Tutors Association (EBTA), Rehovot, Israel.

Correspondence to: capes@netvision.net.il

doi: 10.1111/dmcn.12362

SIR—The recent review by Novak et al.¹ delivers a ‘do not do it’ verdict on neurodevelopmental therapy (NDT), traditionally attributed to the Bobaths.

One has to wonder why (1) in spite of the bad publicity the Bobath-NDT approach has been receiving over the past decade, thousands of therapists world over are attending Bobath-NDT basic, refresher, and advanced courses; (2) parents of children in all age groups, with all levels of motor and cognitive challenges, follow the Bobath-NDT approach.

Could it be that in the absence of a criterion standard and with knowledge readily available on the internet on

any number of treatment options, parents feel and see that their needs and their child’s needs are well served with the Bobath-NDT approach?

Perhaps research questions should look into the reasons why over a period of 70 years, the Bobath-NDT approach is continuing to expand and spread across cultures and continents.

Bobath and NDT-trained physical therapists, speech and language pathologists, and occupational therapists, closely follow all valuable research, and use it where it fits best, giving full credit to the authors. Is that not what hard-working knowledge brokers and knowledge translators wish for?

Is it not time for researchers and therapists to bridge the gap, get together, and ask what really makes a difference to families when they chose this ‘popular’ NDT approach?

REFERENCE

1. Novak I, McIntyre S, Morgan C, et al. A systematic review of interventions for children with cerebral palsy: state of the evidence. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2013; **55**: 885–910.

Researching conductive education

Rony Schenker¹, Andrew Sutton²

¹ Tsad Kadima, The Association of Conductive Education, Jerusalem, Israel;

² Conduction, Birmingham, UK.

Correspondence to: ronyschenker@gmail.com

doi: 10.1111/dmcn.12363

SIR—The recent review by Novak et al.¹ raises the spectre of conductive education research. Placing conductive education below the ‘worth-it line’, with the advice ‘probably do not do it’, restates a general conclusion of earlier meta-

reviews and looks to mark the scientific verdict on research into the benefits of conductive education.

Or is there an alternative?

Conductive education’s breakout from Hungary in the late 1980s has captured the attention and the enthusiasm of many families around the world, and brought experience of a developmental-educational paradigm for understanding and working with motor disorders. Conductive education is neither a therapy nor a medical intervention and is not provided by medical practitioners or by allied health