

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The Journal of Women's & Pelvic Health Physical Therapy (JWPHPT) is dedicated to publishing evidence and translating clinically relevant knowledge in support of physical therapists practicing in women's and pelvic health physical therapy. *JWPHPT* is the official peer-reviewed publication of the Academy of Pelvic Health of the American Physical Therapy Association. Prior to January 2023, *JWPHPT* was known as the *Journal of Women's Health Physical Therapy*.

JWPHPT encourages manuscript submission on all topics in women's health, gender-related issues, and pelvic physical therapy. Manuscripts are considered for publication with the understanding that the manuscript, with any original findings or data, has not been published previously or is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. Research publications and systematic reviews with meta-analyses receive the highest priority for publication, however, case reports and clinical commentaries are all solicited on an equal basis. The Editorial Board reserves the right to return any manuscript that does not meet Journal review criteria.

The purpose of the review is to provide expert opinion regarding the quality of the manuscript under consideration and should also supply authors with explicit feedback on how to improve their manuscripts so that they will be acceptable for publication in *JWPHPT*. Although confidential comments to the Editor-in-Chief/Associate Editor are respected, any remarks that might help to strengthen the manuscript should be directed to the authors themselves. In direct comments to authors, reviewers must refrain from indicating whether or not the article is publishable. The following is a summary of guiding principles all reviewers should be comfortable abiding by.

1. Manuscript Review

Provide a concise review of the manuscript summarizing the major strengths and weaknesses of the submission. For the reviewer's convenience we include a series of specific questions to guide the review process as follows:

- Overall, how does this article contribute to the current body of knowledge? Why should this article be published?
- Is the problem/research question stated clearly and appropriately linked to the relevant literature?
- Is the methodology described well enough for replication? Is the methodology fitting for the research objective?
- Is the data analysis reasonably presented?
- Have the research findings/results been presented clearly? Do the results answer the research question or correspond to the problem as stated?

- Please comment on the Discussion and Conclusions. Are the major findings explained? Have the results been examined in relation to current literature? Are the limitations reasonable? Is there clear clinical or professional relevance?
- Have the research findings/results been presented clearly? Do the results answer the research question or correspond to the problem as stated?
- Have the research findings/results been presented clearly? Do the results answer the research question or correspond to the problem as stated?
- Please comment on the Discussion and Conclusions. Are the major findings explained? Have the results been examined in relation to current literature? Are the limitations reasonable? Is there clear clinical or professional relevance?
- Are the quality and quantity of references adequate?
- Is the structure, language, grammar, references appropriate?
- Please list any additional specific changes or recommendations.

Comments to the author are seen by the authors and should not include comments related to publishing decisions. Comments to the editor are confidential and only seen by the editorial team.

2. Confidentiality

The review process is strictly confidential and should be treated as such by reviewers. Because the author may have chosen to exclude some people from this process, no one including colleagues or other experts in the field, should be consulted by the reviewer unless such consultations have first been discussed with the Editor-in-Chief.

3. Timely Review

JWPHPT understands that an efficient editorial process that results in timely publication provides a valuable service both to authors and to the community at large. We therefore request that reviewers respond promptly, usually within 7 days of receipt of a manuscript. If you are invited to review a manuscript and unable to perform the review, please reply promptly as well. Ignoring an invitation leads to increased review time for authors. If you would like to perform the review but need additional time, please send a request for an extension to the Editor-in-Chief.

4. Anonymity

JWPHPT practices blinded peer review. We appreciate that blinded peer review is the most appropriate review process because of the close-knit readership community we serve. We disapprove of any attempt on the part of authors to discover the identity of any reviewer or to contact this person directly. Reviewers are asked to adopt the same policy.

5. Editing Reviewers' Reports

The Editor-in-Chief, Senior Editor or Associate Editors do not edit any comments made by reviewers that are intended to be read by the authors unless the language is deemed

inappropriate for professional communication or the comments contain information considered confidential. Such remarks should be reserved for the Confidential Comments to the Editor section of the review form, which is intended to be read only by the editorial team. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their comments to authors. On the other hand, authors should not confuse frank language with unfair criticism.

6. Competing Interests

To the extent possible we respect requests by authors to exclude reviewers whom they consider to be unsuitable. We also, as much as possible, try to rule out those reviewers who may have an obvious competing interest, such as those who may have been collaborators on other projects with the authors of the manuscript under review, those who may be direct competitors, those who may have a known history of antipathy with the author(s), or those who might profit financially from the work. However, it is not possible for all such competing interests to be known by *JWPHPT*, so reviewers who recognize a potential competing interest must inform the Editor-in-Chief and recuse themselves if they feel they are unable to offer an impartial review.

On occasion, reviewers may be asked to offer their opinion on a manuscript that they may have previously reviewed for another journal. This is not in itself a competing interest, it does not in any way decrease the validity of that opinion and may perhaps even enhance it.

7. Feedback to Reviewers

We send reviewers' comments along with the blinded decision letter to all reviewers of that manuscript. Reviewers who may have offered an opinion not in accordance with the final decision should understand that their recommendation was duly considered and that their service was greatly appreciated. Experts often disagree, and it is the job of the Editor-in-Chief, Senior Editor and Associate Editors to make a final publication decision.

Thank You!

We offer sincere thanks to all our reviewers. Your contribution of time and expertise is highly valued, and we hope you will continue to support *JWPHPT* in this way.