

# International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation

## GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The following information may be helpful when reviewing articles for the *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*.

Articles are sent to two referees for blind review. The primary aims of the journal are to disseminate research findings through the publication of academic papers, to explore the relationship between theory and practice and to stimulate the cross-fertilisation of ideas between professionals involved in therapy and rehabilitation. The scope of articles published in the journal should reflect the development and expansion of this area in general. The journal aims to keep professionals informed of new developments by providing a forum for the publication of original and scholarly papers that address all aspects of rehabilitation and therapy practice, education, management and research. It endorses and values interprofessional working and welcomes papers and correspondence from all professional groups.

The referee in reviewing articles is informing and advising the editor who will make the final decision regarding publication. The specific reviewers' comments will normally be passed on (anonymously) to the author. For this reason it is important to give detailed comments that will help both the editor decide on the suitability of the article for publication and help the author(s) develop and improve his/her work/research. The academic level of the articles should generally aim at MSc level with a minimum level of a good BSc(honours) being reached. The reviewer has the choice of accepting, rejecting or re-examining the article following revision. Finally, your feedback and comments are greatly valued on all articles as this is one of the most important factors in maintaining editorial quality and integrity. Thank you for all your hard work and help in undertaking the review process and also for your dedication to the journal.

### The review process

When you are invited to review an article, you will receive an email from the Editor via epress, the journal's online management system. This email will include a link to an anonymised version of the author's manuscript and another link to the website where you can post your comments online.

We usually give about 2-3 weeks for a review and we aim to send compiled comments back to the author(s) within 6 weeks of the original submission. Occasionally, where an article is being aimed for a specific forthcoming issue, we may have to give a short deadline. If you will be unable to review an article within the time given, please inform the Editor immediately, so that either an extension can be given or an alternative reviewer found. It is of utmost importance that reviews are returned promptly so that we can return feedback to the authors within a reasonable period of time. The Journal is in the process of applying for Medline citation and an impact factor; therefore we are extremely keen to keep the submission to publication time within a few months. Your assistance helping achieve this is much appreciated.

You will be asked to provide some constructively expressed feedback for the author, designed to help them revise or rewrite the article for this journal or another. Your comments can be anywhere between a paragraph and something much fuller, depending on what you think appropriate to the particular article. We are happy for you to make specific suggestions on the article (using the 'track changes' option) and email these separately to the Editor, but please also ensure that you also complete the reviewer's decision form with the information requested.

Please consider the relevance of the content to the target audience, the use of the literature and discussion of cited research, and the degree of critical analysis and evaluation.

The reviewer's decision form is divided into two parts — first, for the attention of the editor, the second for the benefit of the author. The first should state your overall recommendation about the suitability of the article for publication. There are five options detailed on the reviewer's decision form.

1. **Accept:** can be published now with no amendments or following minor editorial attention
2. **Accept with minor revisions:** will be ready for publication following minor revision by the author
3. **Revise and resubmit:** a major re-working of the text is still needed
4. **Reject** – not suitable for publication
5. **Submit to another journal**

### Reviewers' checklist:

#### General articles:

- Has the author adhered to the journal's Instructions to Authors?
- Is the article suitable for IJTR readership?
- Is the title relevant/accurate?
- Is the information clinically or otherwise important? Does the article add to knowledge in its specific field?
- Does the article have a sound theoretical, research, or philosophical base?
- Is the article well organized and logically developed?
- Are the graphs/tables/statistics adequate and appropriate? Are they labelled correctly?
- Are the interpretations and conclusions justified from the data?
- Does the author include further recommendations for practice?
- Is the writing style satisfactory, i.e. grammatical and easy to understand?
- Is the article logically presented and are the tables and figures easy to understand?
- Is the article of appropriate length? (i.e. approximately 3000 words)
- Is the article too long and are there any areas that could be omitted or condensed?
- Does the abstract accurately reflect the content of the article?

#### Research reports:

- Is the study original?
- Is the overall design of the study appropriate?
- Are the following adequately and clearly stated: Rationale, Research question, Aims, Methods, Data collection and analysis, Findings, Limitations, Conclusion?
- Has ethical approval been sought?
- Are the results relevant to the problem posed and are they credible and well presented (including the use of tables and figures)?
- Does the study incorporate critical analysis of the data collected?
- Does the study use appropriate statistical tests to analyse data and are these correctly used?

#### References:

- Is the Harvard style of referencing used?
- Are the references correct? (i.e. author, date, title, publisher, place)
- Are they adequate, up-to-date and relevant? Do more need to be included? If so, are there any suggestions?
- No more than about 40 references should be used.

#### Other points to note:

- Have the names of bodies and common concepts (e.g. DoH, RCN, EBP) been included in full at the first mention? Is the use of acronyms/abbreviations consistent?
- Is the English good? Has the author avoided the use of too much jargon?
- Does the author cite too much of his/her own work?
- Is there any evidence of plagiarism?
- Has copyright been infringed?