

Peer Review Guidance

Thank you for agreeing to review for Advances in Rehabilitation. The journal uses double-blind peer review: you will not know the identity of the authors, and the authors will not know your identity. This document explains what we expect from reviewers and provides a checklist for evaluating manuscripts.

BEFORE ACCEPTING AN INVITATION

- Accept only if the manuscript falls within your area of expertise and you can complete the review within the requested time. If you cannot, please decline promptly so that another reviewer can be invited.
- Decline, or inform the editor, if you have a conflict of interest – e.g., you work at the same institution as the authors or have recently collaborated with them, you have a personal relationship or rivalry with them, a financial interest related to the topic, or you are working on closely related research.
- If you recognise the authors despite anonymisation and this could affect your objectivity, inform the editor.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY

- Treat the manuscript and all related materials as confidential. Do not share them or discuss them with others without the editor's permission.
- Do not upload the manuscript or any part of it to generative AI tools or other external services.
- Do not attempt to identify the authors, and do not reveal your identity in your comments to the authors.
- Do not use unpublished information from the manuscript for your own research or advantage.

YOUR RECOMMENDATION

Please recommend one of the following:

- **Accept** – the manuscript can be published in its current form.
- **Minor revision** – limited changes are needed; the revised version may be assessed by the editor without further review.
- **Major revision** – substantial changes are needed; the revised version will be sent back to you for re-review.
- **Reject** – the manuscript is not suitable for publication in the journal (e.g., serious methodological flaws, lack of originality, outside the scope).

Your recommendation is advisory; the final decision is made by the Editor-in-Chief. If the reviewers' opinions differ substantially, the editor may invite an additional reviewer.

STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

- **Comments to the authors:** a short summary of the manuscript and its main contribution; major comments (issues affecting the validity of the findings or conclusions); minor comments (clarity, presentation, references). Comments should be specific, constructive, and objective; personal criticism is unacceptable.
- **Confidential comments to the editor (optional):** e.g., suspected ethical issues, plagiarism, duplicate publication, or data manipulation, or any other information the editor should know.

MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Abstract

Provide comments on the abstract. Specifically, consider whether the abstract:

- is structured and concise and provides a suitable reflection of the study (succinct summary of why, how, and what);
- adequately conveys the results of the study (e.g., including effect sizes, synthesised findings) and the conclusions.

Introduction

Provide comments on the Introduction. Specifically, consider whether the Introduction:

- is understandable and introduces the work conducted;
- provides the necessary detail and definitions;
- provides justification for the study;
- is adequately and appropriately referenced;
- presents the objective/aim of the study.

Material and methods

Provide comments on the Material and Methods. Specifically, consider whether:

- the methods are described in sufficient detail to allow replication;
- the study sample size and key participant characteristics are clearly reported;
- the inclusion and exclusion criteria are clearly specified;
- ethical approval (authority and approval number) is stated where required (in the blinded manuscript these details may appear as “[blinded for review]”);
- the manuscript confirms compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki and describes informed consent procedures (for human studies), and consent for publication where identifiable data or images are included;
- for animal studies, ethical approval is reported and the study is reported in line with the ARRIVE 2.0 guidelines;
- clinical trials were prospectively registered, and the relevant reporting guideline (e.g., CONSORT, PRISMA, STROBE) has been followed;
- the intervention (if applicable), outcome measures, and data collection procedures are clearly described;
- new methods are described in detail and established methods are appropriately cited.

Statistical analysis

- Statistical methods and tests are clearly stated.
- The analyses are appropriate for the study design and data.

Results

Provide comments on the Results. Please assess whether:

- the Results section provides a concise and precise description of the findings;
- there is no unnecessary repetition of data already presented in tables or figures;
- tables and figures are legible, of adequate quality and resolution, correctly constructed, clearly labelled, and consistently numbered.

Discussion

Provide comments on the Discussion. Please assess whether:

- the Discussion does not merely repeat the objective or results of the study;
- the interpretation of the findings is sufficient and appropriate, presenting the key results and analysing their importance and meaning;
- the findings are discussed in the context of the current literature;
- potential limitations of the study (or of the included studies, in the case of a review) are discussed;

- the clinical significance/practical implications of the results are discussed;
- future research directions are appropriately outlined (if applicable).

Conclusions

Provide comments on the Conclusions. Specifically, consider whether:

- the conclusions are justified and aligned with the research question and the results presented;
- no claims are made beyond the evidence provided in the study.