

SPECIFIC REVIEWER TEMPLATE

Reviewers are asked to provide comments for both authors and editors. Confidential comments to the editor are not seen by the authors. Reviewers should not mention their decision to publish in their comments to the authors.

Comments for Both Authors and Editors

1. Major Strengths and Weaknesses:

In composing their critique, reviewers are asked to provide a summary of the Major Strengths and Major Weaknesses of the submission based on the following review criteria:

- A. **Significance:** Does the manuscript address an important issue or critical barrier to progress in the field of women's health physical therapy or abdominal and pelvic care? If this manuscript is published, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will publication of this paper change the theoretical constructs, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive the field of neurologic physical therapy?
- B. **Approach:** Are the overall strategies, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the study? If the study is a pilot study or represents early stages of development, will the strategy used in the study establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed? If the project involves clinical research, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?
- C. **Novel Contribution to the Literature:** Does the manuscript challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense?
- D. **Do you believe your rating would change with revision:** Yes / No

2. Guiding Questions:

To address the major review criteria above, reviewers may find it helpful to consider the following questions:

- What are the main claims of the manuscript and how significant and important are they?
- Is the manuscript innovative and are these claims novel? If not, please specify publications with similar approaches or claims.

- Are the claims properly placed in the context of the previous literature?
- Is the approach sound, well-reasoned and appropriate for the study aims? Is the methodology rigorous, adequately described and appropriate to address the stated purpose of the manuscript?
 - Do the results support the claims? If not, what other evidence is required?
 - Would any additional information improve the manuscript?
 - If the manuscript is considered unsuitable for publication in its present form, does the study itself show sufficient potential to warrant a resubmission in a revised version?
 - Have the authors fully adhered to accepted standards of ethical conduct in human/animal research?

3. In the case of manuscripts deemed worthy of consideration for publication, we would appreciate additional guidance from the reviewer on the following:

- Is the manuscript written with sufficient clarity that it is understandable to non-specialists? If not, how could it be improved?
- Have the authors provided adequate support for their claims without overselling them?
- Have the authors cited the previous literature appropriately?
- Does the manuscript offer sufficient methodological detail that its experiments and analyses could be reproduced?
- *JWHPT* offers authors the option to publish detailed methods as online appendices. Do any particular methods used in the manuscript warrant such publication?

Confidential Comments to the Editor

Please summarize below why you have made your recommendation. These comments are only seen by the editors to assist in the decision making process. Your confidential comments also assist in providing further guidance in properly directing the author should revision be required:

In addition to your confidential comments to the editors, you will be asked to provide one of the following recommendations in on-line review submission portal.

Accept: The manuscript is publishable in its current form. The manuscript is ready to be sent to the production manager at Wolters Kluwer without need of further modification. This is rarely the decision rendered for an initial submission.

Accept with Minor Revisions: The quality of the content is appropriate for publication pending minor changes. This decision indicates that acceptance of the manuscript is conditional and depends on satisfactory completion of the changes requested by the editors and reviewers. The editors may choose whether or not it is necessary to send the manuscript for additional peer review by the original reviewers.

Accept with Major Revisions: This decision indicates that acceptance of the manuscript is conditional and depends on satisfactory completion of the considerable changes requested by the editors and reviewers. A revised manuscript is subject to a full peer review by the editors and original reviewers. If the original reviewers are unavailable, the revised manuscript will be sent to new reviewers. The authors must satisfactorily address all concerns and include an explanation on how the requested changes have been accomplished.

Decision Pending Revisions: The manuscript has not been accepted. The editors and reviewers have serious doubts about publication but are willing to reconsider this decision pending a substantial re-working of critical components of the manuscript. The manuscript content may be of keen interest to the JWHPT readers or could potentially represent a worthwhile contribution. However, there are important aspects of the manuscript which preclude publication. The authors must satisfactorily address all concerns and include an explanation on how the requested changes have been accomplished.

Reject: The manuscript will not be published and is not a candidate for reconsideration. Reasons for rejection include, but are not limited to poor quality, content is inappropriate to the journal, overwhelming formatting and grammatical errors, or conflict of interest or other ethical issues.