



Journal *of*  
Sports Therapy

## Reviewer Handbook

### Introduction

The Journal of Sport Therapy is a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal that advances the science and practice of sport and exercise therapy. The Journal accepts manuscripts for review from any discipline that addresses orthopaedic or sports therapy from any relevant perspective, including kinesiology, motor behaviour, fitness, clinical outcomes, neuroscience, and epidemiology. In addition, the Journal reviews manuscripts that deal with clinical or basic science, but clinical implications should be discussed in all manuscripts submitted for review.

Reviewers of manuscript content are essential to the peer review process and the success of the Journal. Reviewers are asked to comment on the originality and importance of the research, appropriateness of the research design, adequacy of the methodology and experimental techniques, interpretations and discussion of the findings, soundness of the conclusions, and clarity of the writing.

To respond to both the quantity and diversity of submitted manuscripts, the Journal continuously evaluates and expands its reviewer panel. This handbook is designed to assist reviewers with their roles.

---

### The Peer Review Process

A summary of the peer-review process followed by the Journal of Sport Therapy is as follows. Once the manuscript is received, a technical review is completed. The technical review ensures that the authors have followed all required steps for submission. Where research is conducted with human subjects, a human subjects review must be completed at the institution. Authors must also sign the Author Agreement and Photograph Release Forms.

Reviewers are initially contacted by the editorial panel to clarify submission time-frames. Manuscripts are sent electronically to the reviewer. Manuscripts are assigned a number and "blinded" to keep author information confidential. The identity of the reviewers is similarly concealed from the authors. Manuscripts may be accepted or rejected, with or without an invitation for the author to resubmit the manuscript.

### Time Period for Reviews

Reviews are to be completed and submitted back to the editorial committee member within two weeks of reviewers' receipt of manuscripts. All reviews are tracked. Late reviewers will be contacted to remind them when they are overdue. After late reviewers have been given two reminders, the editorial process may proceed without their reviews.

### Reviewer Responsibilities

- Perform a thorough, critical review of the manuscript.
- Provide well-founded, constructive criticism and suggestions for the enhancement and acceptability of the manuscript.
- Inform the editorial committee member of any areas in the manuscript that you feel unqualified to critique.
- Provide justification for your confidential recommendation within your review. If you cannot recommend acceptance because of faulty research design, identify the design as a limitation to the author.
- Read the Instructions for Authors if you are not familiar with manuscript categories or have questions about the type of manuscript submitted. These instructions are available in the Author section of the website (to be added), and are also printed in every issue of the Journal of Sports Therapy.
- Keep a copy of your comments on file, as you may be asked to review this paper again.
- Complete your review within two weeks of receiving the manuscript, and if you are unable to do so, contact the editor.
- Contact the Editor if you have any questions.

### Actions Reviewers Should Not Take

- Return the manuscript without review.
- Waste time copyediting (reviewers are selected as content experts).
- Render a decision about the publication in your comments to the author.
- Submit an incomplete review.

### Basic Guidelines for the Specific Comments Section of Your Review

Please use the categories listed below as headings for your typed comments on additional pages. For guidance to the author(s), and for future reference, your comments should specify the appropriate page, paragraph, and line number.

#### Research Report, Literature Review, Technical Note

**Manuscript title:** appropriate, appealing, descriptive.

**Abstract:** structured, concise, accurate,

**Key Words:** up to six (not in title).

**Introduction:** justified, original, creative, important.

**Methods:** sound, credible.

**Results:** clear, consistent with methods.

**Discussion:** referenced correctly, appropriate, current, relevant.

**Tables and figures:** necessary, relevant, quality.

**Organisation:** logical, presentation.

**Overall:** clinical relevance, clarity of purpose, efficacy of writing.

**Other:** please specify.

**Manuscript title:** appropriate, appealing, descriptive.

**Abstract:** structured, concise, accurate.

**Background:** concise, relevant.

**Diagnosis:** complete, evidence-based, objective.

**Discussion:** referenced correctly, appropriate, current, relevant.

**Tables and figures:** necessary, relevant, quality.

**Organisation:** logical, presentation.

**Other:** please specify.

### Case Report/study

**Manuscript title:** appropriate, appealing, descriptive.

**Abstract:** structured, concise, accurate.

**Background:** concise, relevant.

**Case description:** complete, evidence-based, objective.

**Outcomes:** evidence-based, functional, valid, and reliable.

**Discussion:** referenced correctly, appropriate, current, relevant.

**Tables and figures:** necessary, relevant, quality.

**Organisation:** logical, presentation.

**Other:** please specify.

### Clinical Commentary

**Manuscript title:** appropriate, appealing, descriptive.

**Abstract:** unstructured, concise, accurate, key words up to six (not in title).

**Tables and figures:** necessary, relevant, quality.

**Organisation:** logical, presentation.

**Overall:** clinical relevance, clarity of purpose, efficacy of writing.

**Other:** please specify.

### Submitting a Review

All reviews should be completed and returned in the same format as they were received.