

How can instructions and feedback with external focus be shaped to enhance motor learning in children? A systematic review

Ingrid P.A. van der Veer^{1*}, Evi Verbecque¹, Eugene A.A. Rameckers^{1,2,3}, Caroline H.G. Bastiaenen^{4¶}, Katrijn Klingels^{1¶}

¹ Rehabilitation Research Centre - REVAL, Faculty of Rehabilitation Sciences and Physiotherapy, Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium

² Department of Functioning and Rehabilitation, Research School CAPHRI, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands

³ Centre of Expertise, Adelante Rehabilitation Centre, Valkenburg, the Netherlands

⁴ Department of Epidemiology, Functioning, Participation & Rehabilitation, Research School CAPHRI, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands

* Corresponding author: Ingrid.vanderveer@uhasselt.be (IvdV)

¶ Joint senior authors

Abstract

Aim: This systematic review investigates the effectiveness of instructions and feedback with external focus applied with reduced frequency, self-controlled timing and/or in visual or auditory form, on the

performance of functional gross motor tasks in children aged 2 to 18 with typical or atypical development.

Methods: Four databases (PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, Embase) were systematically searched (last updated May 31st 2021). Inclusion criteria were: 1. children aged 2 to 18 years old; 2. Instructions/feedback with external focus applied with reduced frequency, self-controlled timing, and/or visual or auditory form as intervention, to learn functional gross motor tasks; 3. Instructions/feedback with external focus applied with continuous frequency, instructor-controlled timing, and/or verbal form as control; 4. performance measure as outcome; 5. (randomized) controlled studies. Article selection and risk of bias assessment (with the Cochrane risk of bias tools) was conducted by two reviewers independently. Due to heterogeneity in study characteristics and incompleteness of the reported data, a best-evidence synthesis was performed.

Results: Thirteen studies of low methodological quality were included, investigating effectiveness of reduced frequencies ($n = 8$), self-controlled timing ($n = 5$) and visual form ($n = 1$) on motor performance of inexperienced typically ($n = 348$) and atypically ($n = 195$) developing children, for acquisition, retention and/or transfer. For accuracy, conflicting or no evidence was found for most comparisons, at most time points. However, there was moderate evidence that self-controlled feedback was most effective for retention, and limited evidence that visual analogy was most effective for retention and transfer. To improve quality of movement, there was limited evidence that continuous frequency was most effective for retention and transfer.

Conclusion: More methodologically sound studies are needed to draw conclusions about the preferred frequency, timing or form. However, we cautiously advise considering self-controlled feedback, visual instructions, and continuous frequency.

Registration: Prospero CRD42021225723

Key words: motor learning, child, adolescent, instruction, feedback, external focus

Introduction

Children apply many different gross motor skills in a wide variety of contexts, such as physical education (PE) classes, sports and playtime (1). These so-called functional skills are defined as motor skills used in sports or other daily life activities that entail relatively complex movement organization (2). Most children learn these skills almost effortlessly. Their increasing gross motor competence results from the interaction between factors in child (e.g. age, executive functions, psychological characteristics, and motor skill level), task (e.g. rules of the game, type of task, and level of task complexity) and environment (e.g. opportunities for PE and sports) (1,3–5). However, motor skills learning can be challenging for some children, due to neurological conditions (6,7) or neurodevelopmental disorders (8–11). Motor learning can be defined as a set of processes associated with practice or experience leading to relatively permanent improvements in the capability for producing motor skills (12). Instructors, like PE teachers, trainers, coaches, and occupational and physical therapists, apply motor learning on a daily basis (13–16). They use various motor learning variables, such as instructions and feedback, which they adapt to the child and the task practised (15–19). Their instructions and feedback are shaped by parameters, such as content (e.g. a specific focus of attention), frequency, form (e.g. visual or verbal), and timing (self- or instructor-controlled) (18,20,21).

With implicit motor learning, a child learns without awareness and with no or minimal increase in verbal knowledge (22). It is suggested that children benefit from this type of learning, because there is minimal involvement of the working memory (2,23,24). Implicit motor learning can be shaped by using an external focus of attention (EF) (23). With an EF, the child's attention is steered to the impact of the movement on the environment (23). A recent systematic review investigated effectiveness of implicit

learning strategies in functional motor skills learning in typically developing children (TDC) (23). They concluded that the use of an EF appeared to be as, or even more, effective than an internal focus of attention (IF), which directs the child's attention to its body movements (23). An EF was also more effective than an IF in motor learning for children with Mild Intellectual Disabilities (MID) (25) and Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (26). However, an IF appeared more effective in children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) (27). In children with Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD), no differences were found for retention and transfer between groups using an EF or an IF (28,29).

When using an EF in practical settings, instructors have to decide how often (frequency), when (timing) and in what form to provide their instructions and feedback (20). Feedback can be provided after each trial (continuous frequency) or after a number of trials (reduced frequency) (30,31). It is indicated that reduced frequency is preferred in stroke patients (31). However, in (a)typically developing children, this remains unclear (30). The timing of instructions and feedback can be determined by the instructor (instructor-controlled) or the child (self-controlled) (32). Self-controlled feedback may enhance children's motor learning more than instructor-controlled feedback (32). Most instructions and feedback are provided verbally (23,30,32) but instructors also use visual, tactile, and auditory (e.g. sound beeps) forms (14,17,19,20). Currently, it remains unclear what frequency, form and timing are to be preferred when using instructions and feedback with EF (14,30,32).

While previous reviews suggest that the effectiveness of EF may be moderated by child and task characteristics, like working memory capacity, motor skill level and type of task (23,32), we hypothesize that the effectiveness of EF may also be moderated by the instructors' chosen frequency, timing, and form. Therefore, this systematic review investigates the effectiveness of instructions and feedback with EF applied with reduced frequency, in visual or auditory forms, and/or on request of the child (I), compared to instructions and feedback with EF applied with continuous frequency, in verbal form,

and/or initiated by the instructor (C), on the performance of functional gross motor tasks (O) in children aged 2 to 18 with typical and atypical development (P).

Methods

A systematic review of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and non-randomized controlled clinical trials (CCTs) was performed. The hypotheses were: 1. instructions and feedback with EF applied with reduced frequency will be more effective than those applied with continuous frequency; 2. self-controlled instructions and feedback with EF will be more effective than instructor-controlled instructions and feedback; and 3. visual or auditory instructions and feedback with EF will be more effective than verbal instructions and feedback. This systematic review is written according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses 2020 (PRISMA 2020) (33,34) and registered in the international prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO) under registration number: CRD42021225723.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion and exclusion criteria were defined in line with the PICOT structure (Population, Intervention, Control, Outcome, Type of study).

Inclusion criteria were:

1. Population: Children with (a)typical development aged 2-18 years. Studies which included a combined population of adolescents and adults were included if there were sub-analyses with adolescents.

2. Intervention: Instructions or feedback with EF applied with reduced frequency, in visual or auditory form and/or with self-controlled timing, used to learn functional gross motor tasks. An analogy, a metaphor that integrates the complex structure of the to-be-learned task (35), is considered an EF because a child aims to reproduce the metaphor (36). Reduced frequencies can be applied in fixed frequency (feedback after a fixed number of trials) or faded frequency (reducing the frequency over time) (30,31).

3. Control: Instructions and feedback with EF applied with continuous frequency, in verbal form and/or with instructor-controlled timing.

4. Outcome: A performance measure (e.g. accuracy or quality of movement) as primary outcome, used to assess acquisition and/or learning of functional gross motor tasks. Acquisition is measured during practice blocks or with a post-intervention test ("post-test"), and learning is measured with retention and/or transfer tests (37).

5. Type of study: Studies using a RCT or CCT without randomization design.

6. Publication type: Publications of original RCTs and CCTs.

7. Language: Studies written in English or Dutch.

Exclusion criteria were:

1. Population: Children with (a)typical development under the age of 2 years or adults.

2. Intervention: Intervention methods like Neuromotor Task Training, because they provide no insight into effectiveness of separate instructions or feedback; instructions and feedback used to learn laboratory, fine motor and static balance tasks, because they did not meet the definition of functional gross motor task (2).

3. Control: A tactile form of instructions and feedback, because of its IF.

4. Outcome: Outcome measures that assessed brain anatomy and functions as primary outcomes.

5. Type of study: Studies performed with designs other than RCT and non-randomized CCT.

6. Publication type: Conference proceedings/reports and books.

7. Language: Studies not written in English or Dutch.

Literature search

A systematic search was conducted in PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus and Embase. The search was last updated on the 31st of May 2021. Because instructions and feedback are also used when applying practice conditions, a broad search query was used to ensure that no relevant studies were missed. The search terms concerned four key topics: motor learning, instruction, feedback, and practice conditions. These topics were combined as motor learning AND (instruction OR feedback OR practice conditions). An explorative search to inventorize relevant search terms showed that, in title and abstract, participants were often described in general (e.g. subjects). It also showed that various outcome measures were used to assess motor task performance (e.g. accuracy, speed, count, distance). To prevent studies being missed, search terms did not incorporate terms related to population or outcome. No date restrictions or filters were applied. See S1 file for the detailed search queries.

Study selection

The eligibility of the studies was assessed in two phases: on title and abstract (phase 1); on full text (phase 2). The selection criteria were applied in a fixed sequence (population, intervention, control, outcome, type of study, publication type and language) by two reviewers independently (lvdV and EV). If necessary, authors were contacted for full texts. After each phase, a consensus meeting discussed the results of the article selection. Full text versions were read in case of disagreement after phase 1 and an

independent reviewer (ER) was consulted in case of disagreement after phase 2. References of the included studies and of the three systematic reviews concerning children's motor learning (23,30,32) were checked by one reviewer (lvdV) to ensure that all relevant studies had been included.

Data extraction

Data were extracted using a standardized sheet by one reviewer (lvdV or EV) and checked and complemented by the other. Corrections and additions were discussed between both reviewers; in the case of disagreement, an independent reviewer (ER) was consulted. Authors were not contacted for further details about studies.

For each study, the following data were extracted: 1. Characteristics of the study design: information regarding the group allocation of the participants (e.g. randomization procedure), blinding of participants, assessors, outcome measures and all relevant data for analyses; 2. Population characteristics: number of participants in total and per group, age range, mean age and standard deviations (SD), skill level (inexperienced or trained), and diagnosis, if given; 3. Intervention characteristics: details about instructions or feedback to the experimental and control group(s), the task, and the practice sessions (e.g. frequency, volume and duration); 4. Outcome and assessment time points: the primary and secondary outcome(s) to measure motor performance and type and timing of measurements in acquisition and test phase (pre-, post-, retention and/or transfer tests); 5. Results: summary statistics with measures of precision for each group, the data for differences between groups, and thresholds of minimal clinically important differences.

Methodological quality assessment

The revised Risk of Bias tool (RoB2), for randomized trials (38), and the Risk of Bias in Non-randomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) (39), were used to assess methodological quality.

The RoB2 evaluates five major domains of biases: selection, performance, detection, attrition, and reporting biases. Signalling questions were answered to reach a domain-specific RoB judgement of 'low', 'some concerns' or 'high'. If not referred to a registered trial protocol, Questions 5.2 and 5.3 were answered based on the data-analysis section. Using the judgements of the five domains, an overall RoB judgement was made. If at least four domains were of some concern, the overall RoB was considered high.

The ROBINS-I evaluates seven major domains of biases: confounding, selection, classification, performance, detection, attrition, and reporting biases. As for the RoB2, signalling questions were used to reach a domain-specific RoB judgement of 'low', 'moderate', 'serious', 'critical' or 'no information'. If not referred to a registered trial protocol, Questions 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 were answered based on the data-analysis section. Based on the domain-specific judgements, an overall RoB judgement was made.

Four reviewers (lvdV, EV, ER and KK) investigated RoB. Each study was assessed by two reviewers independently. Consensus was reached in a meeting with all reviewers.

Analyses

Results were described for study selection, study characteristics and methodological quality. To answer the hypotheses, as a first step a meta-analysis was planned with studies comparable for study design, instructions and feedback, and task. Therefore, the instructions and feedback were coded according to each parameter (frequency, timing and form). For frequency, the intervention was coded as reduced

fixed or reduced faded frequency and the control as continuous frequency (hypothesis 1). For timing, the intervention was coded as self-controlled and the control as instructor-controlled (hypothesis 2). For form, the intervention was coded as visual or auditory and the control as verbal (hypothesis 3). Studies were grouped according to the type of comparison between coded intervention and control. Each task is defined by its own constraints, which are related to the context in which the task is performed (40). Only studies with similar tasks could be combined in a meta-analysis. After subgrouping in subsequent steps according to (firstly) task and (secondly) population (TDC and per diagnosis), it was still not possible to pool data due to heterogeneity and to the incompleteness of the reported data. Therefore, a best-evidence synthesis was performed. The best-evidence synthesis table was structured according to the parameter of interest (frequency, timing, or form) and subdivided into comparisons of coded interventions and controls, as described above. If studies included more than one group with reduced frequency, the frequency that was most comparable with other studies was used for analysis. Within comparisons, studies were ordered according to comparable tasks, mentioning studies of good methodological quality first to increase the prominence of the most trustworthy evidence. Results were described per outcome measure. The results of each study were rated as significant (favouring a specific frequency, timing or form), inconsistent or not significant (41). Then, the evidence for each comparison was rated according to the guidelines of van Tulder et al. (41): strong (consistent findings among multiple high quality RCTs), moderate (consistent findings among multiple low quality RCTs and/or CCTs and/or one high quality RCT), limited (one low quality RCT and/or CCT), conflicting (inconsistent findings among multiple RCTs and/or CCTs), or no evidence from trials (no RCTs or CCTs). Consistency was defined as 75% of the studies assessing the same comparison showing results in the same direction.

Results

Study selection

The search resulted in 3813 unique hits. After screening title and abstract, 3521 hits were excluded. The remaining 292 hits were screened on full text, eight of which met the inclusion criteria. Reasons for exclusion were not meeting the criteria for: population ($n = 150$), intervention ($n = 84$), control ($n = 1$), type of study ($n = 41$), publication type ($n = 7$) or language ($n = 1$). Of the excluded studies, 24 investigated effectiveness of instructions and feedback with EF in children's functional gross motor learning in comparison with an IF and/or no instructions or feedback, without distinction in frequency, timing or form between groups (26–28,42–62). Of the studies that distinguished in frequency, timing or form between groups, eight used an IF (63–70). One study was excluded because its control group also used reduced instead of continuous frequency (71) (S2 file: overview of the excluded studies that nearly met inclusion criteria). Additionally, five studies were found through the references check, resulting in a total of 13 included studies (Fig 1).

Insert figure 1 about here

Study characteristics

Seven out of 13 studies included 348 inexperienced TDC (72–78), ages ranging from 6 (76,77) to 13 years (78). Seven studies included 195 inexperienced children with motor disabilities (77,79–84), ages ranging from 6 (77,80,83) to 18 years (80). Mean ages and SDs were not reported in five studies (75–77,79,84). The children with motor disabilities comprised children with MID (82), DCD (84), ASD (77,83) or CP (79–81). Overall, the studies involved small sample sizes, the number of participants per group ranging from 6 (84) to 16 (82), with six studies having samples of 10 or less (73,77,79–81,84). All studies used object

control tasks (72– 84), 12 throwing (72–81,83,84) and one golf-putting (82). In 10 studies, participants practised only once (72–78,81–83), the number of trials ranging from 30 (75) to 90 (78,83). Participants in the remaining studies practised five times with a total of 100 trials (80), or eight times with a total of 240 trials (79,84) (Table 1).

Insert table 1 about here

The effectiveness of feedback with EF applied in **reduced frequency** compared to **continuous frequency** was investigated in eight studies (73–79,82), six of which included TDC (73–78). The remaining studies included children with ASD (77) or CP (79). The reduced frequency was applied in three fixed frequencies of 20% (82), 33% (74,75) and 50% (76–79), and one faded frequency decreasing from 100% to 0% with an average of 62% (73). All studies assessed accuracy (73–79,82), with two also measuring variability (74,78), and one quality of movement (75). Acquisition was assessed in all studies (73–79,82), while retention tests were used in seven (73–77,79,82), in which timing varied from 24 hours (73,75–77,82) to 1 week (74,82). Only three studies measured transfer (74,75,78), in which timing varied from immediately after practice (0 hours) (74,75,78) to 1 week (74) (Table 1).

Effectiveness of **self-controlled feedback** compared to **instructor-controlled feedback** to improve accuracy in object control tasks was investigated in five studies (72,73,80,81,84). TDC were included in two studies (72,73), while the others included children with DCD (84) or CP (80,81). In four studies, the frequency of the self- and instructor-controlled feedback was the same (72,80,81,84), while in one frequencies were different, 33% in the self-controlled group and 100% in the instructor-controlled group (73). All studies measured acquisition and retention (72,73,80,81,84). In most studies, retention was measured after 24 hours (72,73,80,81), though in one the timing was unclear (84). One-day transfer tests were used in two studies (Table 1).

One study with children with ASD and MID investigated the effectiveness of **visual analogy** compared to **verbal analogy** for improving accuracy in basketball shooting on acquisition, retention (24 hours), and transfer (0 and 24 hours) (83) (Table 1).

Methodological quality

Twelve RCTs were assessed with the RoB2, all of which having an overall RoB judgement of high (72–78,80–84) (Fig 2a). Although studies mentioned randomized groups, none described the generation method used and whether allocation was concealed (72–78,80–84). Only one study provided a demographic characteristics table (83). Most studies were at high risk for performance bias, none of the studies reported using intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis and how they handled missing data (72–78,80–84). Most studies were also at high risk for detection bias, only one study reported no missing data (84). In six studies, the F statistics showed that there were missing data, but information on the amount, at which time point and in which group was lacking (73–75,78,80,81). In most studies, outcome assessors were not blinded or it remained unclear whether they were blinded (72–82,84). None referred to a registered trial protocol, raising concerns about possible reporting bias (72–84). The study of Hemayattalab & Rostami (2010) (79) was the only non-randomized CCT included. It had an overall judgement of serious RoB due to a serious RoB in measurement of outcomes, while the remaining domains were at low RoB (79) (Fig 2b).

Insert figure 2 about here

Best-evidence synthesis

Regarding frequency of feedback (hypothesis 1), three out of seven studies investigated the effectiveness of reduced fixed frequency in similar tasks (74,76,77). However, one reported no summary

statistics (74) and the other two had the same first author (76,77). The remaining studies used non-comparable tasks (75,78,79,82). Only one study examined the effectiveness of reduced faded frequency. As regards timing of feedback (hypothesis 2), four out of five studies included similar tasks (72,73,81,84), but summary statistics were lacking in two of these (72,73); the remainder included different populations (81,84), and only one investigated a visual form of instruction (hypothesis 3). Therefore, all studies were included in the best-evidence synthesis (72,73,82–84,74–81) (Table 2). Although each study described whether there were significant group differences, none mentioned thresholds for minimal clinically important differences (72,73,82–84,74–81).

The following paragraphs describe the results from the best-evidence synthesis for the parameters frequency, timing and form. For frequency, results were reported for the outcomes accuracy, variability and quality of movement. Studies of timing and form only assessed accuracy. For each parameter, results are ordered according to the following time points: 1. Acquisition measured during practice; 2. Acquisition measured with a post-test; 3. Retention; and 4. Transfer.

Insert table 2 about here

Frequency

The evidence whether reduced fixed frequency of feedback was more effective than continuous frequency (hypothesis 1) in improving **accuracy** of object control tasks on acquisition was conflicting (74–76,78,79,82). For *acquisition measured during practice*, continuous frequency appeared more effective in TDC and in children with ASD (77) or MID (82) (76,77); however, two other studies with TDC found no significant group differences (74,78). For *acquisition measured with a post-test*, the results of the studies varied with the population. No significant group differences were found in TDC (74,75), while continuous frequency appeared more effective in children with CP (79). For *retention*, conflicting evidence was also found (74–76,78,79,82): for TDC, two studies found no significant group differences (74,75), while two

other studies indicated that reduced frequency was more effective (76,77); for children with motor disabilities, results showed that children with CP (79) and MID (82) performed best with reduced frequency while children with ASD did best with continuous frequency (77). For *transfer*, no evidence supported either frequency in TDC (74,75,78) (Table 2). Only one study compared reduced faded frequency to continuous frequency to improve **accuracy** in beanbag throwing in TDC (73). For *acquisition measured during practice*, they found no significant group differences (73). For *retention*, limited evidence was found favouring continuous frequency (73) (Table 2).

There was no evidence that reduced fixed or continuous frequency was more effective in reducing **variability** in throwing in TDC at *all four time points* (74,78). The study that assessed **quality of movement** in soccer ball throwing in TDC found no evidence supporting either frequency for *acquisition measured with a post-test* (75). However, for *retention* and *transfer* limited evidence was found favouring continuous frequency (75). (Table 2).

Timing

For **accuracy** in object control tasks, conflicting evidence was found on effectiveness of self-controlled versus instructor-controlled feedback (hypothesis 2) with equal frequency for *acquisition measured during practice* (72,80,81). Of the studies including children with CP (80,81), one showed that self-controlled timing was more effective (80), while another found no significant group differences (81); no significant group differences were found in TDC (72). Also, no significant group differences were found in children with DCD for *acquisition measured with a post-test* (84). For *retention*, the self-controlled group performed best in three studies (72,81,84), including TDC (72), children with CP (81) and DCD (84). A fourth study showed no significant group differences in children with CP (80), which resulted in only moderate evidence favouring self-controlled timing (72,80,81,84). For *transfer*, the evidence was

conflicting in children with CP: while one study showed that self-controlled timing was more effective, another found no significant group differences (80,81) (Table 2).

One study used different frequencies in the self- and instructor-controlled groups to improve **accuracy** in beanbag throwing in TDC (73). For *acquisition measured during practice*, no evidence supported either timing. However, there was limited evidence that 100% instructor-controlled feedback was more effective than 33% self-controlled feedback for *retention* (73) (Table 2).

Form

One study investigated the effectiveness of visual analogy compared to verbal analogy (hypothesis 3) used to improve **accuracy** in basketball throwing in children with ASD and MID (83). For *acquisition measured with a post-test*, no evidence supported either form (83). However, for *retention* limited evidence was found favouring a visual form of instruction (83) (Table 2).

Discussion

The aim of this systematic review was to investigate the effectiveness of instructions and feedback with EF applied with reduced frequency, with self-controlled timing or in visual form in the learning by (a)typically developing children of functional gross motor tasks. Previous research investigating effectiveness of instructions or feedback with EF found conflicting results for children (23,32) and adults (37,85). It was hypothesized that the frequency, timing and/or form of instructions and feedback (20) influenced their effectiveness. The following paragraphs will discuss results by each hypothesis.

First, it was hypothesized that reduced frequency would be more effective than continuous frequency. However, the results of the best-evidence synthesis did not support this. On the contrary, limited evidence showed that, for retention, continuous frequency was more effective than reduced faded

frequency to improve accuracy in throwing beanbags in TDC (73). Also, limited evidence favoured continuous frequency to improve quality of movement in soccer ball throwing in TDC for retention and transfer (75) (Table 2). For acquisition, conflicting evidence was found, but studies found either no significant group differences (73–75,78) or significant differences favouring continuous frequency (76,77,79,82). A possible reason why continuous frequency appeared more effective could be the short practice duration, as most studies included only one practice session (73–78,82) (Table 1). At the beginning of the learning process, more information (e.g. by means of more instructions and feedback) is needed to acquire new skills (12,86,87). With inexperienced children, it is likely that some children remained in the early learning stage due to insufficient repetitions and, therefore, performed better with continuous frequency. In practical settings, children have longer training periods. Therefore, future studies adopting longer practice durations would be more of more practical interest. This limited or conflicting evidence is in line with previous research. A systematic review investigating effectiveness of frequency of feedback to improve upper limb motor skills in TDC and children with CP found limited evidence that, for TDC, continuous frequency was more effective for acquisition and reduced faded frequency for retention when learning laboratory tasks (30). For reduced fixed frequencies in TDC, no conclusions could be drawn due to inconsistency in results (30). Based on three pre-post design studies, the review concluded that both faded and continuous frequency improved upper limb motor learning (30). As such, it was not possible to draw conclusions about the preferred frequency.

Secondly, it was hypothesized that self-controlled timing would be more effective than instructor-controlled timing. The results of the best-evidence synthesis confirmed this, with moderate evidence for retention when frequency of feedback was similar in both groups (72,80,81,84) (Table 2). On the contrary, when frequencies were dissimilar, the instructor-controlled group appeared more effective for retention (73). This inconsistency may be due to the frequency of feedback, as the self-controlled group received less feedback than the instructor-controlled group (Table 1) (73). For all other time points,

either no or conflicting evidence was found. This might be due to the low methodological quality of the included studies, which will be elaborated later. A systematic review investigating the effectiveness of autonomy support in children's functional skill motor learning yielded similar results (32). It found that self-controlled feedback was more effective in several studies, but it was argued that child characteristics, like trait anxiety, cognitive skills and age, may have influenced effectiveness (32). The advantages of self-controlled feedback were also found in adults (36). However, both reviews included studies with EF and IF (32,36). Although more evidence is needed to draw conclusions for all time points, the results from the best-evidence synthesis, supported by previous research, suggests that instructors should consider using self-controlled timing in children's motor learning.

Finally, it was hypothesized that children learnt functional gross motor skills best with a visual form of instructions and feedback compared to a verbal form. However, only one study investigated this specific comparison (83). Post-hoc comparisons showed that children with ASD threw more accurately after a visual analogy (83). Similar results were found in studies with healthy young adults and young adults with Down syndrome, where skill performance improved more after video (88,89) or instructor demonstration (90) than with verbal instructions with EF. Although evidence is limited, instructors might consider using pictures, videos or real live demonstrations as instructions or feedback to teach children motor skills.

This was the first study to systematically investigate the modifying role of frequency, timing and form in instructions and feedback with EF on children's motor learning. A strength of this study was that it followed a registered protocol, comprising a selection process and RoB assessment performed by two reviewers independently, with a third to be consulted in cases of disagreement. Furthermore, RoB was assessed by means of reference standards (the Cochrane RoB tools) and findings were analysed according to a prespecified plan. There was no need to contact authors of included studies for further

details. There is a small possibility that we interpreted reported information slightly different than meant by the authors.

Providing recommendations for instructors about the frequency, timing and form of instructions and feedback with EF appeared challenging for two particular reasons. Firstly, drawing evidence-based conclusions was difficult because of the poor methodological quality of the studies (72,73,82–84,74–81) (Fig. 2). In particular, blinding of outcome assessors, analysing according to ITT, and handling missing data properly require attention in future studies (91,92). Furthermore, authors should report methods and results in more detail, essential for adequately determining the RoB (91,92). It is possible that methodological quality appeared lower due to insufficient reporting of details. Additionally, the generally small sample sizes and the lack of reported thresholds of clinically meaningful differences also hindered interpretation. Inadequate sample sizes increase the risk of finding non-significant results or contrary conclusions with similar studies (93,94). This might have influenced the number of non-significant results found in individual studies and, more specifically, the lack of evidence or the conflicting evidence in the best-evidence synthesis (Table 2) (93,95). In particular, the results of the post-hoc comparisons should be interpreted cautiously (93). Although some studies found significant differences, it remains unclear whether these differences are large enough to be relevant in practical settings (96,97). More methodologically sound studies based on proper sample size calculations are needed to draw conclusions regarding the preferred frequency, timing and form of instructions and feedback.

Secondly, generalizability of the results was hampered because all included studies used object control tasks with inexperienced children, and measured accuracy. This overrepresentation of tasks, skill level and outcome is in line with previous research (23,32). In therapy, PE classes and sports, children learn various tasks with different levels of complexity (98) and, depending the child's needs, instructors teach new tasks to novice children or optimize existing skills in experienced or trained children (8,99,100). The *challenge point framework* conceptualizes the amount and specificity of information needed to

learn skills, based on the level of task complexity, the skill level of the individual, and the interaction of level of complexity with skill level (86). Thus, instructors should adapt frequency, timing and form of instructions and feedback to the individual and the task. Future research should attempt to include a wider variety of tasks and/or skill levels in studies, firstly, because this will improve generalizability, and secondly, to gain a better understanding of the influencing roles of task and skill level on the effectiveness of frequency, timing and form. In order to guarantee comparability of studies, a framework that classifies tasks based on their characteristics could be helpful. Future research should give attention to developing such a framework. Potentially relevant characteristics are the number of degrees of freedom, cognitive demands, sequence of movement structure, spatial and temporal demands, and the context of tasks (2,40,87). As for outcome, few studies assessed variability (74,78) or quality of movement (75), as well as accuracy. In practical settings, instructors often focus on improving functionality instead of normality (8,99,100). From that point of view, accuracy is a relevant outcome, because it focuses on the result of the performance instead of on the optimal movement pattern. However, instructors can target various improvements, depending on the child's need. Therefore, more result-related outcomes (e.g. variability, number of successful attempts and distance) and movement pattern-related outcomes (e.g. quality of movement and kinematic variables) should be considered in future studies. Irrespective of the chosen outcome, researchers should use valid, reliable and responsive outcome measures.

Conclusion

Based on the results of this systematic review, instructors should consider using self-controlled feedback with EF to enhance children's motor learning (moderate evidence). Regarding a specific frequency or form, no conclusions can be drawn yet. However, based on limited evidence, instructors could consider

using visual instructions and continuous frequency when aiming to improve quality of movement. Because specific child and task characteristics can also moderate the effectiveness of instructions and feedback (23,32,86), instructors should explore the optimal frequency, timing and form for each child until more research provides us with a better understanding of their moderating role. Future research should put effort into developing a framework that classifies tasks based on their characteristics. Furthermore, it should aim to advance insights into the modifying role of frequency, timing and form in instructions and feedback with EF with methodologically sound studies focusing on a variety of tasks, skill levels and outcome measures.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

References

1. Flôres FS, Rodrigues LP, Copetti F, Lopes F, Cordovil R. Affordances for motor skill development in home, school, and sport environments: a narrative review. *Percept Mot Skills*. 2019;126(3): 366–388.
2. Steenbergen B, van der Kamp J, Verneau M, Jongbloed-Pereboom M, Masters RSW. Implicit and explicit learning: applications from basic research to sports for individuals with impaired movement dynamics. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2010;32(18): 1509–1516.
3. Verbecque E, Coetzee D, Ferguson G, Smits-Engelsman B. High BMI and low muscular fitness predict low motor competence in school-aged children living in low-resourced areas. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(15): 7878.

4. Barnett LM, Lai SK, Veldman SLC, Hardy LL, Cliff DP, Morgan PJ, et al. Correlates of gross motor competence in children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Med.* 2016;46(11): 1663–1688.
5. Buszard T, Reid M, Masters R, Farrow D. Scaling the equipment and play area in children’s sport to improve motor skill acquisition: a systematic review. *Sports Med.* 2016;46(6): 829–843.
6. Sadowska M, Sarecka-Hujar B, Kopyta I. Cerebral palsy: current opinions on definition, epidemiology, risk factors, classification and treatment options. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat.* 2020;16: 1505–1518.
7. Clutterbuck GL, Auld ML, Johnston LM. High-level motor skills assessment for ambulant children with cerebral palsy: a systematic review and decision tree. *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2020;62(6): 693–699.
8. Blank R, Barnett A, Cairney J, Green D, Kirby A, Rosenblum S, et al. International clinical practice recommendations on the definition, diagnosis, assessment, intervention and developmental coordination disorder (DCD). *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2019;61(3): 242–285.
9. Jeyanthi S, Arumugam N, Parasher RK. Effect of physical exercises on attention, motor skill and physical fitness in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: a systematic review. *Atten Deficit Hyperact Disord.* 2019;11(2): 125–137.
10. Bünger A, Urfer-Maurer N, Grob A. Multimethod assessment of attention, executive functions, and motor skills in children with and without ADHD: children’s performance and parents’ perceptions. *J Atten Disord.* 2021;25(4): 596–606.
11. Wilson RB, Enticott PG, Rinehart NJ. Motor development and delay: advances in assessment of motor skills in autism spectrum disorders. *Curr Opin Neurol.* 2018;31(2): 134–139.

12. Shumway-Cook A, Woollacott MH. Motor Control: translating research into clinical practice. 5th ed. Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia; 2016.
13. Valvano J. Activity-focused motor interventions for children with neurological conditions. Phys Occup Ther Pediatr. 2004;24(1–2): 79–107.
14. Ross S, Metcalf A, Bulger SM, Housner LD. Modified Delphi investigation of motor development and learning in physical education teacher education. Res Q Exerc Sport. 2014;85(3): 316–329.
15. Levac D, Wishart L, Missiuna C, Wright V. The application of motor learning strategies within functionally based interventions for children with neuromotor conditions. Pediatr Phys Ther. 2009;21(4): 345–355.
16. Otte FW, Davids K, Millar SK, Klatt S. When and how to provide feedback and instructions to athletes?—How sport psychology and pedagogy insights can improve coaching interventions to enhance self-regulation in training. Front Psychol. 2020;11: 1444.
17. MacWilliam KR, Giancola JR, Wright FV, Ryan JL. Use of motor learning strategies in occupational therapy for children and youth with acquired brain injury. Phys Occup Ther Pediatr. 2021;42: 30–45.
18. Kleynen M, Braun SM, Rasquin SMC, Bleijlevens MHC, Lexis MAS, Halfens J, et al. Multidisciplinary views on applying explicit and implicit motor learning in practice: an international survey. PLoS One. 2015;10(8): e0135522.
19. Niemeijer AS, Schoemaker MM, Smits-Engelsman BCM. Are teaching principles associated with improved motor performance in children with developmental coordination disorder? A pilot study. Phys Ther. 2006;86(9): 1221–1230.
20. Levac D, Missiuna C, Wishart L, DeMatteo C, Wright V. Documenting the content of physical

therapy for children with acquired brain injury: development and validation of the motor learning strategy rating instrument. *Phys Ther.* 2011;91(5): 689–699.

21. Kafri M, Atun-Einy O. From motor learning theory to practice: a scoping review of conceptual frameworks for applying knowledge in motor learning to physical therapist practice. *Phys Ther.* 2019;99(12): 1628–1643.

22. Kleynen M, Braun SM, Bleijlevens MH, Lexis M a., Rasquin SM, Halfens J, et al. Using a Delphi technique to seek consensus regarding definitions, descriptions and classification of terms related to implicit and explicit forms of motor learning. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(6): e100227.

23. van Abswoude F, Mombarg R, de Groot W, Spruijtenburg GE, Steenbergen B. Implicit motor learning in primary school children: a systematic review. *J Sports Sci.* 2021;39(22): 2577–2595.

24. van der Kamp J, Steenbergen B, Masters RSW. Explicit and implicit motor learning in children with unilateral cerebral palsy. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2018;40(23): 2790–2797.

25. Chiviakowsky S, Wulf G, Avila LTG. An external focus of attention enhances motor learning in children with intellectual disabilities. *J Intellect Disabil Res.* 2013;57(7): 627–634.

26. Saemi E, Porter J, Wulf G, Ghotbi-Varzaneh A, Bakhtiari S. Adopting an external focus of attention facilitates motor learning in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Kinesiology.* 2013;45(2): 179–185.

27. Tse ACY. Effects of attentional focus on motor learning in children with autism spectrum disorder. *Autism.* 2017;23(2): 405–412.

28. van Cappellen–van Maldegem SJM, van Abswoude F, Krajenbrink H, Steenbergen B. Motor learning in children with developmental coordination disorder: the role of focus of attention and working memory. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2018;62: 211–220.

29. Jarus T, Ghanouni P, Abel RL, Fomenoff SL, Lundberg J, Davidson S, et al. Effect of internal versus external focus of attention on implicit motor learning in children with developmental coordination disorder. *Res Dev Disabil*. 2015;37: 119–126.
30. Robert MT, Sambasivan K, Levin MF. Extrinsic feedback and upper limb motor skill learning in typically-developing children and children with cerebral palsy: review. *Restor Neurol Neurosci*. 2017;35(2):171–84.
31. van Vliet P, Wulf G. Extrinsic feedback for motor learning after stroke: What is the evidence? *Disabil Rehabil*. 2006;28(13–14): 831–840.
32. Simpson T, Ellison P, Carnegie E, Marchant D. A systematic review of motivational and attentional variables on children’s fundamental movement skill development: the OPTIMAL theory. *Int Rev Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2020;14(1): 312–358.
33. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372: n160.
34. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372: n71.
35. Liao CM, Masters RSW. Analogy learning: a means to implicit motor learning. *J Sports Sci*. 2001;19(5): 307–319.
36. Wulf G, Lewthwaite R. Optimizing performance through intrinsic motivation and attention for learning: The OPTIMAL theory of motor learning. *Psychon Bull Rev*. 2016;23(5): 1382–1414.
37. Kal E, Prosée R, Winters M, van der Kamp J. Does implicit motor learning lead to greater automatization of motor skills compared to explicit motor learning? A systematic review. *PLoS*

One. 2018;13(9): e0203591.

38. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019;366: l4898.

39. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*. 2016;355: i4919.

40. Newell KM, Liu Y-T. Collective variables and task constraints in movement coordination, control and skill. *J Mot Behav*. 2020;53(6): 770–796.

41. van Tulder M, Furlan A, Bombardier C, Bouter L. Updated method guidelines for systematic reviews in the cochrane collaboration back review group. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2003;28(12): 1290–1299.

42. Lola AC, Tzetzis G. Analogy versus explicit and implicit learning of a volleyball skill for novices: the effect on motor performance and self-efficacy. *J Phys Educ Sport*. 2020;20(5): 2478–2486.

43. Meier C, Fett J, Gröben B. The influence of analogy instruction and motion rule instruction on the learning process of junior tennis players: qualitative assessment of serve performance. *Ger J Exerc Sport Res*. 2019;49: 291–303.

44. Meier C, Frank C, Gröben B, Schack T. Verbal instructions and motor learning: how analogy and explicit instructions influence the development of mental representations and tennis serve performance. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11: 2.

45. Schlapkohl N, Tanja H, Raab M. Effects of instructions on performance outcome and movement patterns for novices and experts in table tennis. *Int J Sport Psychol*. 2012;43(6): 522–541.

46. Tse ACY, Fong SSM, Wong TWL, Masters R. Analogy motor learning by young children: a study of rope skipping. *Eur J Sport Sci*. 2017;17(2): 152–159.

47. Chiviacowsky S, Wulf G, Ávila LTG. An external focus of attention enhances motor learning in children with intellectual disabilities. *J Intellect Disabil Res.* 2013;57(7): 627–634.
48. Bahmani M, Babak M, Land WM, Howard JT, Diekfuss JA, Abdollahipour R. Children’s motor imagery modality dominance modulates the role of attentional focus in motor skill learning. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2021;75: 102742.
49. Brocken JEA, Kal EC, van der Kamp J. Focus of attention in children’s motor learning: examining the role of age and working memory. *J Mot Behav.* 2016;48(6): 527–534.
50. Chow JY, Koh M, Davids K, Button C, Rein R. Effects of different instructional constraints on task performance and emergence of coordination in children. *Eur J Sport Sci.* 2014;14(3): 224–232.
51. Emanuel M, Jarus T, Bart O. Effect of focus of attention and age on motor acquisition, retention, and transfer: a randomized trial. *Phys Ther.* 2008 Feb;88(2): 251–260.
52. Gredin V, Williams AM. The relative effectiveness of various instructional approaches during the performance and learning of motor skills. *J Mot Behav.* 2016;48(1): 86–97.
53. Hadler R, Chiviacowsky S, Wulf G, Schild JFG. Children’s learning of tennis skills is facilitated by external focus instructions. *Motriz Rev Educ Fis.* 2014;20(4): 418–422.
54. Krajenbrink H, van Abswoude F, Vermeulen S, van Cappellen S, Steenbergen B. Motor learning and movement automatization in typically developing children: the role of instructions with an external or internal focus of attention. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2018;60: 183–190.
55. Moran KA, Murphy C, Marshall B. The need and benefit of augmented feedback on service speed in tennis. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2012;44(4): 754–760.
56. Parr R, Button C. End-point focus of attention: learning the “catch” in rowing. *Int J Sport Psychol.* 2009;40(4): 616–635.

57. Perreault ME, French KE. Differences in children's thinking and learning during attentional focus instruction. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2016;45: 154–160.
58. Perreault ME, French KE. External-Focus Feedback Benefits Free-Throw Learning in Children. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 2015;86(4): 422–427.
59. Roshandel S, Taheri H, Moghadam A. Effects of different attentional focus on learning a motor skill in children. *Biosci Res.* 2017;14(2): 380–385.
60. Teixeira da Silva MBA, Thofehrn Lessa HMS, Chiviacowsky S. Learning of a classical ballet pirouette. *J Danc Med Sci.* 2017;21(4): 179–184.
61. Tse ACY, van Ginneken WF. Children's conscious control propensity moderates the role of attentional focus in motor skill acquisition. *Psychol Sport Exerc.* 2017;31: 35–39.
62. Widenhoefer TL, Miller TM, Weigand MS, Watkins EA, Almonroeder TG. Training rugby athletes with an external attentional focus promotes more automatic adaptations in landing forces. *Sports Biomech.* 2019;18(2): 163–173.
63. de Carvalho da Silva L, Pereira-Monfredini CF, Teixeira LA. Improved children's motor learning of the basketball free shooting pattern by associating subjective error estimation and extrinsic feedback. *J Sports Sci.* 2017;35(18): 1–6.
64. Weeks DL, Kordus RN. Relative frequency of knowledge of performance and motor skill learning. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 1998;69(3): 224–230.
65. Goudini R, Ashrafpoornavaee S, Farsi A. The effects of self-controlled and instructor-controlled feedback on motor learning and intrinsic motivation among novice adolescent taekwondo players. *Acta Gymnica.* 2019;49(1): 33–39.
66. Lemos A, Wulf G, Lewthwaite R, Chiviacowsky S. Autonomy support enhances performance

expectancies, positive affect, and motor learning. Psychol Sport Exerc. 2017;31: 28–34.

67. Adams D. The relative effectiveness of three instructional strategies on the learning of an overarm throw for force. Phys Educ. 2001;58(2): 67.

68. Potdevin F, Vors O, Huchez A, Lamour M, Davids K, Schnitzler C. How can video feedback be used in physical education to support novice learning in gymnastics? Effects on motor learning, self-assessment and motivation. Phys Educ Sport Pedagog. 2018;23(6): 559–574.

69. Pasetto SC, Barreiros JMP, Corrêa UC, Freudenheim AM. Visual and kinaesthetic instructional cues and deaf people’s motor learning. Int J Instr. 2020;14(1): 161–180.

70. Puklavec A, Antekolović L, Mikulić P. Acquisition of the long jump skill using varying feedback. Croat J Educ. 2021;23(1): 107–132.

71. Petranek LJ, Bolter ND, Bell K. Attentional focus and feedback frequency among first graders in physical education. J Teach Phys Educ. 2018;38(3): 199–206.

72. Chiviacowsky S, Wulf G, de Medeiros FL, Kaefer A, Tani G. Learning benefits of self-controlled knowledge of results in 10-year-old children. Res Q Exerc Sport. 2008;79(3): 405–410.

73. Sabzi AH, Roozbahani M, Poor JR. The effect of different schedules of feedback on skill acquisition in children. Middle East J Sci Res. 2012;11(5): 628–633.

74. Sidaway B, Bates J, Occhiogrosso B, Schlagenhauser J, Wilkes D. Interaction of feedback frequency and task difficulty in children’s motor skill learning. Phys Ther. 2012;92: 948–957.

75. Wulf G, Chiviacowsky S, Schiller E, Avila LTG. Frequent external-focus feedback enhances motor learning. Front Psychol. 2010;1: 190.

76. Zamani MH, Zarghami M. Effects of frequency of feedback on the learning of motor skill in

preschool children. Int J Sch Health. 2015;2(1): 1–6.

77. Zamani MH, Fatemi R, Karimi S. Effects of feedback with different frequency on throwing skill learning in children with autism spectrum disorder compared to normal children. Int J Sch Health. 2015;2(1): e23760.

78. de Oliveira DL, Corrêa UC, Gimenez R, Basso L, Tani G. Relative frequency of knowledge of results and task complexity in the motor skill acquisition. Percept Mot Skills. 2009;109(3): 831–840.

79. Hemayattalab R, Rostami LR. Effects of frequency of feedback on the learning of motor skill in individuals with cerebral palsy. Res Dev Disabil. 2010;31: 212–217.

80. Hemayattalab R. Effects of self-control and instructor-control feedback on motor learning in individuals with cerebral palsy. Res Dev Disabil. 2014;35(11): 2766–2772.

81. Hemayattalab R, Arabameri E, Pourazar M, Ardakani MD, Kashefi M. Effects of self-controlled feedback on learning of a throwing task in children with spastic hemiplegic cerebral palsy. Res Dev Disabil. 2013;34(9): 2884–2889.

82. Gillespie M. Summary versus every-trial knowledge of results for individuals with intellectual disabilities. Adapt Phys Act Q. 2003;20(1): 46–56.

83. Tse ACY, Masters RSW. Improving motor skill acquisition through analogy in children with autism spectrum disorders. Psychol Sport Exerc. 2019;41: 63–69.

84. Zamani MH, Fatemi R, Soroushmoghadam K. Comparing the effects of self-controlled and examiner-controlled feedback on learning in children with developmental coordination disorder. Iran J Psychiatry Behav Sci. 2015;9(4): e2422.

85. Piccoli A, Rossettini G, Cecchetto S, Viceconti A, Ristori D, Turolla A, et al. Effect of attentional focus instructions on motor learning and performance of patients with central nervous system

and musculoskeletal disorders: A systematic review. *J Funct Morphol Kinesiol*. 2018;3(3): 1–20.

86. Guadagnoli MA, Lee TD. Challenge point: a framework for conceptualizing the effects of various practice conditions in motor learning. *J Mot Behav*. 2004;36(2): 212–224.

87. Wulf G, Shea CH. Principles derived from the study of simple skills do not generalize to complex skill learning. *Psychon Bull Rev*. 2002;9(2): 185–211.

88. Ringenbach SDR, Mulvey GM, Chen CC, Jung ML. Unimanual and bimanual continuous movements benefit from visual instructions in persons with Down syndrome. *J Mot Behav*. 2012;44(4): 233–239.

89. Benjaminse A, Welling W, Otten B, Gokeler A. Transfer of improved movement technique after receiving verbal external focus and video instruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2018;26(3): 955–962.

90. Meegan S, Maraj BK, Weeks D, Chua R. Gross motor skill acquisition in adolescents with Down syndrome. *Downs Syndr Res Pract*. 2006;9(3): 75–80.

91. Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gøtzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010 explanation and elaboration: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2010;340: c869.

92. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 Statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2010;340(7748): 698–702.

93. Brooks GP, Johanson GA. Sample size considerations for multiple comparison procedures in ANOVA. *J Mod Appl Stat Methods*. 2011;10(1): 97–100.

94. Serdar CC, Cihan M, Serdar MA. Sample size, power and effect size revisited: simplified and practical approaches in pre-clinical, clinical and laboratory studies. *Biochem Med*. 2021;31(1):

010502.

95. Wilson Van Voorhis CR, Morgan BL. Understanding power and rules of thumb for determining sample sizes. Tutor Quant Methods Psychol. 2007;3(2): 43–50.
96. Kallogjeri D, Spitznagel EL, Piccirillo JF. Methods to explain the clinical significance of health status measures. JAMA Otolaryngol Surg. 2020;146(2): 101–102.
97. McGlothlin AE, Lewis RJ. Minimal clinically important difference: defining what really matters to patients. JAMA - J Am Med Assoc. 2014;312(13): 1342–1343.
98. Hulteen RM, Morgan PJ, Barnett LM, Stodden DF, Lubans DR. Development of foundational movement skills: a conceptual model for physical activity across the lifespan. Sports Med. 2018;48(7): 1533–1540.
99. Geijen M, Ketelaar M, Sakzewski L, Palisano R, Rameckers E. Defining functional therapy in research involving children with cerebral palsy: a systematic review. Phys Occup Ther Pediatr. 2020;40(2): 231–246.
100. Bartlett R, Wheat J, Robins M. Is movement variability important for sports biomechanists? Sports Biomech. 2007;6(2): 224–243.

Supporting information

S1 file. Search queries for the individual databases

S2 file. Excluded studies that nearly met inclusion criteria

Funding

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data and materials availability statement

All relevant data are available in this manuscript or its Supporting Information files.

Authors' contribution

IvdV, EV, ER, CB and KK designed the overall setup of the systematic review. IvdV and EV conducted the entire search, study selection and data extraction. Methodological quality was assessed by IvdV, EV, ER and KK. All authors drafted the manuscript and performed multiple revisions. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Fig 1. Prisma flow diagram of the study selection

Fig 1 Legend: n = number




Fig 2. Methodological quality of the included studies

Fig 2a. Methodological quality assessed with RoB2

Fig 2a legend: D1 = selection bias; D2 = performance bias; D3 = detection bias; D4 = attrition bias; D5

= reporting bias;  = low risk;  = some concerns;  = high risk.

	Risk of bias domains					Overall
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	
Chiviacowsky et al. 2008						
De Oliveira et al. 2009						
Gillespie 2003						
Hemayattalab 2014						
Hemayattalab et al. 2013						
Sabzi et al. 2012						
Sidaway et al. 2012						
Tse & Masters 2019						
Wulf et al. 2010						
Zamani & Zarghami 2015						
Zamani et al. 2015 (ASD/TDC)						
Zamani et al. 2015 (DCD)						

Fig 2b. Methodological quality assessed with ROBINS-I

Fig 2b legend: D1 = bias due to confounding; D2 = selection bias; D3 = classification bias, D4 = bias due to deviation from intended interventions; D5 = bias due to missing data; D6 = bias in measurement of outcomes; D7 = reporting bias;  = low risk;  = serious risk.

		Risk of bias domains							
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Overall
Study	Hemayattalab & Rostami 2010								

Table 1. Study characteristics of the included studies

Author(s), year	Population characteristics Type (n) Mean age in years (SD) Skill level	Study design	Intervention characteristics			Measurements Outcome Covariables	Assessment time points	Results > significantly better than = no significant differences
			Groups (n)	Task	Practice			
Frequency								
Gillespie, 2003	Children with MID, IQ range 55-70 (n = 32) 10.8 (0.68) Inexperienced	RCT	20% frequency: KR after every fifth trial^a 100% frequency: KR after every trial^a	Golf-putting task	1 practice session of 10 blocks of 5 trials (total 50 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-5 based on zones around the target (higher is better)	During acquisition Retention: 24h 1w	ANOVA analysis <u>Acquisition:</u> Significant main effect for frequency 100% > 20* <u>Retention 24h:</u> Significant main effect for frequency 20% > 100%* <u>Retention 1w:</u> Significant main effect for frequency 20% > 100%*
Hemayattalab & Rostami, 2010	Children with CP, GMFCS 1 (n = 24) 7-15 ^b Inexperienced	Non-randomized CCT	50% frequency: KR on half of the trials (n = 8) 100% frequency: KR after every trial (n = 8) 0% frequency: no KR (n = 8)	Dart throwing	8 practice sessions of 6 blocks of 5 trials, period not reported (total 240 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: registered in points based on zones around the target (higher is better)	Pre-test During acquisition Post-test Retention: 72h	ANOVA analysis with post-hoc Tukey HSD tests <u>Post-test:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 100% > 50%** , 100% > 0%** and 50% > 0%* <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 50% > 100%** , 50% = 0% (p = 0.093) and 100% = 0% (p = 0.146)

de Oliveira et al., 2009	TDC (n = 120) 11.8 (1.2) Inexperienced	RCT	- Simple task + 25% frequency: KR after a quarter of the trials (n = 15) - Simple task + 50% frequency: KR after half of the trials (n = 15) - Simple task + 75% frequency: KR after three quarters of the trials (n = 15) - Simple task + 100% frequency: KR after every trial (n = 15) - Complex task + 25% frequency: KR after a quarter of the trials (n = 15) - Complex task + 50% frequency: KR after half of the trials (n = 15) - Complex task + 75% frequency: KR after three quarters of the trials (n = 15) - Complex + 100% frequency: KR after every trial (n = 15)	Bocha game throwing - Simple task: throw with backward-forward pendulum movement of the arm - Complex task: throw with same pendulum movement followed by an overhead circular movement of the arm	1 practice session of 9 blocks of 10 trials (total 90 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: absolute error in cm (lower is better) Variability: variable error in cm (lower is better)	During acquisition Transfer: 0h	ANOVA analysis with post-hoc Tukey HSD tests Accuracy <u>Acquisition:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 25% > 50%, 75% and 100%* and 75% > 50%* <u>Transfer:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 25% > 50%* Variability <u>Acquisition:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 25% > 50%, 75% and 100%* and 75% > 50% and 100%* <u>Transfer:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 25% > 50%, 75% and 100%*
--------------------------	--	-----	---	--	---	--	------------------------------------	---

Sabzi et al., 2012	TDC (n =40) 10.4 (1.0) Inexperienced	RCT	- Reduced frequency: KR with faded frequency from 100% to 0% (n = 10) 100% frequency: KR after every trial (n = 10) - Self-controlled: KR on request in 3 out of every 10 trials (n = 10) - Bandwidth: feedback when score is less than 50 out of 100 points (n = 10)	Throw with beanbag at target on the floor ^c	1 practice session of 6 blocks of 10 trials (total 60 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-100 based on zones around the target (higher is better)	During acquisition Retention: 24h	ANOVA analysis with post-hoc Tukey HSD tests <u>Acquisition:</u> No significant main effect for groups <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for groups Post-hoc testing: 100% > reduced feedback, SC and bandwidth*
Sidaway et al., 2012	TDC (n =48) 10.7 (0.6) Inexperienced	RCT	- Simple task + 33% frequency: KR after every third trial^a - Simple task + 100% frequency: KR after every trial^a - Complex task + 33% frequency: KR after every third trial^a - Complex task + 100% frequency: KR after every trial^a	Throw with beanbag at target on the floor - Simple task: throw while standing - Complex task: throw while walking	1 practice session of 6 blocks of 12 trials (total 72 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: absolute error score varied from 0-3 based on zones around the target (lower is better) Variability: variable error based on the standard deviation about the mean score (lower is better)	During acquisition Post-test: in analysis referred to as retention 0h Retention: 1w Transfer: 0h 1w	ANOVA analysis ^e Accuracy <u>Acquisition:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Retention 0h and 1w:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Transfer 0h and 1w:</u> No significant main effect for frequency Variability <u>Acquisition:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Retention 0h and 1w:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Transfer 0h and 1w:</u> No significant main effect for frequency

Wulf et al., 2010	TDC (n = 48) 10-12 ^b Inexperienced	RCT	33% frequency with external focus: feedback after every third trial with focus on ball, target or shoes (n = 12) 100% frequency with external focus: feedback after every trial with focus on ball, target or shoes (n = 12) 33% frequency with internal focus: feedback after every third trial with focus on the body (n = 12) 100% frequency with internal focus: feedback after every trial with focus on the body (n = 12)	Throw with soccer ball at target on the floor	1 practice session of 6 blocks of 5 trials (total 30 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-5 based on zones around the target (higher is better) Quality of movement: score varied from 0-8 (8 criteria, per criteria 1 point if performed correctly and 0 point if not) (higher is better)	During acquisition Post-test: in results referred to as retention 0h Retention: 24h Transfer: 0h 24h	ANOVA analysis^e Accuracy <u>Acquisition:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Retention:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Transfer:</u> No significant main effect for frequency Quality of movement <u>Acquisition:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Retention:</u> No significant main effect for frequency <u>Transfer:</u> No significant main effect for frequency
Zamani & Zarghami, 2015	TDC (n = 45) 6-8 ^b Inexperienced	RCT	50% frequency: KR after every second trial^a 100% frequency: KR after every trial^a 0% frequency: no KR^a	Throw with beanbag at target on the floor ^c	1 practice session of 6 blocks of 10 trials (total 60 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-100 based on zones around the target (higher is better)	Pre-test During acquisition Retention: 24h	ANOVA analysis with post-hoc Tukey HSD tests <u>Acquisition:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 100% > 50% **, 100% > 0% **, and 50% > 0% ** <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 50% > 100% **, 50% > 0% **, and 100% > 0% **

Zamani et al., 2015	TDC (n = 21) Children with ASD (n = 21) 6-8 ^b Inexperienced	RCT	50% frequency: KR after every second trial (TDC: n = 7 / ASD: n = 7) 100% frequency: KR after every trial (TDC: n = 7 / ASD: n = 7) 0% frequency: no KR (TDC: n = 7 / ASD: n = 7)	Throw with beanbag at target on the floor ^c	1 practice session of 6 blocks of 10 trials (total 60 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-100 based on zones around the target (higher is better)	Pre-test During acquisition Retention: 24h	ANOVA analysis with Tukey-Kramer tests TDC <u>Acquisition:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 100% > 50%**, 100% > 0%** and 50% > 0%** <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 50% > 100%**, 50% > 0%** and 100% > 0%** Children with ASD <u>Acquisition:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 100% > 50%**, 100% > 0%** and 50% > 0%** <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for frequency Post-hoc testing: 100% > 50%**, 100% > 0%** and 50% > 0%**
Timing								
Chiviacowsky et al., 2008	TDC (n = 26) 10.0 (0.5) Inexperienced	RCT	- Self-controlled: KR on request (n = 13) - Yoked: KR whenever counterpart requested feedback (n = 13)	Throw with beanbag at target on the floor	1 practice session of 6 blocks of 10 trials (total 60 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-100 based on zones around the target (higher is better)	During acquisition Retention: 24h	ANOVA analysis <u>Acquisition:</u> No significant main effect for timing <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for timing SC > yoked*

Hemayattalab et al., 2013	Children with CP, GMFCS 1-3 (n = 24) 11.6 (1.5) Inexperienced	RCT	- Self-controlled: KR on request (n = 10) - Yoked: KR whenever counterpart requested feedback (n = 10)	Throw with beanbag at target on the floor ^c	1 practice session of 10 blocks of 8 trials (total 80 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-100 based on zones around the target (higher is better)	Pre-test During acquisition Post-test Retention: 24h Transfer: 24h	MANOVA analysis <u>Post-test:</u> - No significant main effect for timing (p = 0.473) <u>Retention:</u> - Significant main effect for timing (p = 0.003) SC > yoked <u>Transfer:</u> - Significant main effect for timing (p = 0.018) SC > yoked
Hemayattalab et al., 2014	Children with CP, GMFCS 1 (n = 22) 12.26 (3.11) Inexperienced	RCT	- Self-controlled: KR on request in maximum half of the trials (n = 8) - Instructor-controlled: KR when instructor wanted in half of the trials (n = 7) - Control: no KR (n = 7)	Dart throwing	5 practice sessions of 4 blocks of 5 trials, period not reported (total 100 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-100 based on zones around the target (higher is better)	During acquisition (mean scores practice session 1 and 5 used as pre- and post-test) Retention: 24h Transfer: 24h	ANOVA analysis with post-hoc Tukey HSD tests <u>Post-test:</u> No significant main effect for timing <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for timing Post-hoc testing: SC = IC*, SC > control (p = 0.014) and IC = control* <u>Transfer:</u> Significant main effect for timing Post-hoc testing: SC = IC*, SC > control* and IC = control (p > 0.05)

Tse & Masters, 2019	Children with ASD and MID, IQ range 50–70 (n = 48) 10.10 (2.0) Inexperienced	RCT	• Instruction with visual analogy (n = 12) • Instruction with verbal analogy (n = 12) • Explicit instruction: with internal focus on arm or hand (n = 12) • Control: no specific instruction (n=12)	Basketball free throw	1 practice session of 6 blocks of 15 trials (total 90 trials)	<u>Outcome</u> Accuracy: score varied from 0-5 based on zones around the target (higher is better) <u>Covariates</u> Age IQ WMI SRS-2	During acquisition Retention: 24h Transfer: 24h	Pearson correlation • Covariables were not correlated to accuracy score ANOVA analysis with post-hoc tests with Bonferroni correction • <u>Acquisition:</u> Significant main effect for group Post-hoc testing: visual analogy > control**, verbal analogy > control** and explicit > control** • <u>Retention:</u> Significant main effect for group Post-hoc testing: visual analogy > verbal analogy** 95% CI = [1.57, 9.77], visual analogy > explicit** 95% CI = [1.07, 9.27], visual analogy > control** 95% CI = [5.65, 13.85], verbal analogy > control* 95% CI = [-0.02, 8.18], explicit > control* 95% CI = [0.48, 8.68] and verbal analogy = explicit (p = 0.74) 95%CI [-4.60, 3.60] • <u>Transfer:</u> Significant main effect for group Post-hoc testing: visual analogy > verbal analogy** 95% CI = [2.50, 9.00], visual analogy > explicit** 95% CI = [1.41, 7.92], visual analogy > control** 95% CI = [5.91, 12.42], verbal analogy > control* 95% CI = [0.16, 6.67], explicit > control* 95% CI = [1.25, 7.75] and verbal analogy = explicit (p = 0.39) 95%CI [-4.34, 2.17]
---------------------	--	-----	--	-----------------------	---	---	---	--

Legend: n = number; SD = standard deviation; h = hour(s); w = week(s); RCT = randomized controlled trial; CCT = controlled clinical trial; KR = knowledge of results; MID = mild intellectual disabilities; IQ = intelligent quotient; CP = cerebral palsy; GMFCS = gross motor functioning classification system; TDC = typically developing children; ASD = autistic spectrum disorder; DCD = developmental coordination disorder; SC = self-

controlled; IC = instructor-controlled; CI = confidence interval; IQ = intelligence quotient; WMI = Working Memory Index; SRS-2 = social responsiveness scale, 2nd ed. ^a number per group not reported; ^b only age range was reported; ^c according to protocol Chiviawowsky 2008; ^d same target as Chiviawowsky 2008; ^e not reported which post-hoc test used; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 2. Best-evidence synthesis of instructions or feedback applied with a specific frequency, timing or form

Parameter studied	Comparison	Author	Task (Population)	Evidence synthesis per study						Evidence synthesis summary			
				Acquisition		Retention		Transfer		Acquisition		Retention	Transfer
				During	Post	Timing	Effect	Timing	Effect	During	Post		
Accuracy													
Frequency	Reduced fixed vs continuous	Sidaway et al. 2012	Throw with beanbag (TDC)	NS	NS	1w	NS	0h 1w	NS NS	X	X	X	-
		Zamani & Zarghami 2014	Throw with beanbag (TDC)	C	NA	24h	R	NA	NA				
		Zamani et al. 2015	Throw with beanbag (TDC)	C	NA	24h	R	NA	NA				
			Throw with beanbag (Children with ASD)	C	NA	24h	C	NA	NA				
		Wulf et al. 2010	Throw with soccer ball (TDC)	NA	NS	24h	NS	0h 24h	NS NS				
		De Oliveira et al. 2009	Throw with bocha ball (TDC)	NS	NA	NA	NA	0h	NS				
		Hemayattalab & Rostami 2010	Dart throwing (Children with CP)	NA	C	72h	R	NA	NA				
		Gillespie 2003	Golf putting (Children with MID)	C	NA	24h 1w	R R	NA	NA				
	Reduced faded vs continuous	Sabzi et al. 2012	Throw with beanbag (TDC)	NS	NA	24h	C	NA	NA	-	NA	* C	NA

Timing	Self-controlled vs instructor-controlled (equal frequency in both groups)	Chiviacowsky et al. 2008	Throw with beanbag (TDC)	NS	NA	24h	SC	NA	NA	X	-	** SC	X
		Hemayattalab et al. 2013	Throw with beanbag (Children with CP)	NS	NA	24h	SC	24h	SC				
		Zamani et al. 2015	Throw with tennis ball (Children with DCD and MID)	NA	NS	NR	SC	NA	NA				
		Hemayattalab et al. 2014	Dart throwing (Children with CP)	SC	NA	24h	NS	24h	NS				
	Self-controlled vs 100% feedback	Sabzi et al. 2012	Throw with beanbag (TDC)	NS	NA	24h	C	NA	NA	-	NA	* C	NA
Form	Visual analogy vs verbal analogy	Tse & Masters 2019	Basketball free throw (Children with ASD and MID)	NS	NA	24h	VisA	24h	VisA	-	NA	* VisA	* VisA
Variability													
Frequency	Reduced fixed vs continuous	Sidaway et al. 2012	Throw with beanbag (TDC)	NS	NS	1w	NS	1w	NS	-	-	-	-
		De Oliveira et al. 2009	Throw with bocha ball (TDC)	NS	NA	NA	NA	0h	NS				
Quality of movement													
Frequency	Reduced fixed vs continuous	Wulf et al. 2010	Throw with soccer ball (TDC)	NA	NS	24h	C	0h 24h	C C	NA	-	* C	* C

Legend: h = hour(s); w = week(s); TDC = typically developing children; ASD = autistic spectrum disorder; CP = cerebral palsy; MID = mild intellectual disabilities; DCD = developmental coordination disorder; NA = not applicable; NR = not reported; C = significant, favouring continuous frequency; R = significant, favouring reduced frequency; SC = significant, favouring self-controlled feedback; VisA = significant, favouring the visual analogy. Consistency was defined as 75% of the studies assessing the same comparison showing results in the same direction. Strength of the evidence according to the guidelines of van Tulder et al.:

*** = Strong – consistent findings among multiple high quality RCTs

** = Moderate – consistent findings among multiple low quality RCTs and/or CCTs and/or one high quality RCT

* = Limited – one low quality RCT and/or CCT

X = conflicting – inconsistent findings among multiple RCTs and/or CCTs.

- = no evidence from trials – no RCTs or CCTs