


## MANUSCRIPT ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL FOR REVIEWERS

Dear reviewer: This protocol is intended to be an aid oriented to the realization of your assessment and not a limitation to it. To this protocol you may add those aspects that you considers appropriate, aimed at improving the formal presentation and scientific content of the manuscript, when it deserves a favorable assessment.

To carry out the evaluation, at the same time as this protocol, you should also consider the Instructions for authors (attached), available on the web <http://cuestionesdefisioterapia.com>

Once completed, send the evaluation by email to [cuestionesdefisioterapia@us.es](mailto:cuestionesdefisioterapia@us.es)



**Journal:** *Cuestiones de Fisioterapia*

**Director:** Jesús Rebollo Roldán. PhD.

**Co-Director:** Tomás Gallego Izquierdo. PhD.

**Manuscript N° Ref.:**

**Title of the Manuscript:**

**Reviewer:**

**Reviewer sending date:**

**Return date:**

### Instructions for the Reviewer

**Before proceeding to the evaluation I accept or reject it taking into account the following considerations:**

**Accept / Reject**

1. Be qualified as an expert to evaluate the matter discussed in the manuscript

2. Follow this protocol as a guide to elaborate the content, style and format of the review, specific aspects of the originals that must be evaluated and which be ignored, always respecting the authors.

3. Destroy the manuscript once the report has been read and issued

4. Submit the report within a maximum period of 15 days.

5. Declare any conflict of personal, academic, research, economic or financial interests in relation to the manuscript

6. Preserve the confidentiality regarding the manuscript and revision

7. Know the magazine's compensation awards

8. Accept the final Acceptance or Rejection decision about the manuscript taken by the Editorial Board

Sign: \_\_\_\_\_



**Journal:** *Cuestiones de Fisioterapia*

**Director:** Dr. Jesús Rebollo Roldán

**Co-Director:** D. Tomás Gallego Izquierdo

**Manuscript Ref No:**

**Type of Manuscript:**

Original Articles	
Short Originals	
Case Studies	
Reviews	
Letters to the Director	
Special Articles	

**Title of the Manuscript:**

**Reviewer:**

**Reviewer sending date:**

**Return date:**

### Complete as final evaluation conclusion

#### 1.- RECOMMENDATION:

Accept	
Accept with minor corrections	
Accept with major corrections (New review process)	
Reject	
Publication Priority	

#### 2.- GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF WORK QUALITY

High	
Good	
Average	
Low	

#### 3.- ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINALITY AND RELEVANCE

(regarding the scientific information contained in the article: -new and valuable, -results already known, - irrelevant)

highest	
Average	
lowest	

<b>4.- TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS:</b>			
<b>4.1 STRUCTURE AND STYLE</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NOT</b>	<b>IMPROVE OR CHANGE</b>
♦ <b>Appropriate title (whether it is clear, concise and informative )</b>			
- Spanish			
- English			
♦ <b>The Summary is correct (clear, it includes the aims, design, methods, the variables considered, main results and the most relevant conclusions).</b>			
- Spanish			
- English			
♦ <b>The structure of the dissertation is adequate</b>			
♦ <b>The style is appropriate (clear, concise and follows a logical sequence)</b>			
<b>4.2 BASIS, METHODOLOGY, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NOT</b>	<b>IMPROVE OR CHANGE</b>
♦ <b>Is the general subject, issue or problem immediately and clearly identified?</b>			
♦ <b>Is the specific subject, issue or problem clearly defined and determined?</b>			
♦ <b>Does the bibliographic review take into account the most important and recent works related to the subject of study?</b>			
♦ <b>Are the aims of the work clearly shown?</b>			
♦ <b>Are the methodology or techniques proposed adequate to achieve the objective of the study?</b>			
♦ <b>Are the given data, materials, sources, etc., sufficient to replicate the study?</b>			
♦ <b>Are the statistical tests used appropriate for the analysis variables employed and respond to the hypotheses developed?</b>			
♦ <b>If appropriate, are the sample, number of cases covered and/or follow-up of the tests or trials adequate?</b>			
♦ <b>Are the results adequate and do they correspond to the data obtained in the work?</b>			
♦ <b>Do the results provide relevant information regarding the objectives of the study?</b>			
♦ <b>Are bibliographic references sufficient, appropriate and current?</b>			
♦ <b>Do the conclusions interpret and correspond to the results obtained in the work?</b>			
♦ <b>The illustrations (figures, photographs, etc.) and tables:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NOT</b>	<b>IMPROVE OR CHANGE</b>
- Are either sufficient and appropriate			
- Are excessive and redundant. Suppress the number...			
- They can be improved in the presentation and interpretation of number...			
♦ <b>Others</b>			

Manuscript Ref. No Title: Reviewer	<b>Journal:</b> <i>Cuestiones de Fisioterapia</i> <b>Director:</b> Dr. Jesús Rebollo Roldán <b>Co-Director:</b> D. Tomás Gallego Izquierdo
--	--

**EVALUATION COMMENTS** (Compose keeping in mind that they can be sent to the authors). In this section, the reviewer will write the comments they deem appropriate, explaining and supporting their judgment. Comments are necessary to justify the decision of the editors and for them to send the pertinent explanations to the authors. It is recommended to follow the order established in point 4 of this protocol. If necessary, use additional sheets.

Manuscript No: Title: Reviewer :	<b>Revista: <i>Cuestiones de Fisioterapia</i></b> <b>Director: Dr. Jesús Rebollo Roldán</b> <b>Co-Director: Dr. Tomás Gallego Izquierdo</b>
--	---

**CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS** (These are comments related to the acceptability of the manuscript and addressed only to the editor).

He revisado el artículo y declaro: que no tengo interés financiero ni intelectual, ni personal en relación con este artículo y que no difundiré la información obtenida a través de la revisión del artículo previamente a su publicación

Nombre:
Lugar y fecha:

Sign.

additional sheets