



Paper: “Clinical Treatment Prescription in Physiotherapy: A Scoping Review of Conceptual and Operational Parameters”

Submitted: 09 March 2026

Accepted: 10 April 2026

Published: 30 April 2026

Corresponding Author: Job Salazar

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n12p14

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gordana Nikola Stankovska
University of Tetova, Republic of Macedonia

Reviewer 2: Tsvetelina Bizheva
National Sports Academy, Bulgaria

Reviewer 3: Daniel Mossalbaye Adendjingue
CHU La Référence National, N’Djamena, Tchad

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear, only the word Operational in (Operational Parameters) could be replaced with a more appropriate one

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract correctly mentions the main elements of the article regarding the methods used, the results obtained, and a brief conclusion is made

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The Methods section describes the research design, eligibility criteria, and lists the sources of information used, as well as the keywords used. The search includes all publications available in the database, but I don't see the initial search period, I assume it's for the last ten years.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The study selection process is illustrated in the PRISMA flow diagram.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The results show that many studies do not provide explanations of specific parameters such as frequency, intensity, duration, and treatment structure, which are essential components in rehabilitation programs.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The literature sources used in the study are from the last ten years, which indicates a review of the latest available literature on the topic under consideration

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

oui

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

See the comment in the text for some modification. Objective must be short and clear without commentary

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

no comment

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

See the comment in the text for some corrections.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

It is necessary to standardize the style of references. FOR EXAMPLE, VANCOUVER. References 6 {Campbell Systematic Reviews, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1230>} and 12 {In Annals of Internal Medicine (Vol. 169, number 7, pp. 467-473). American College of Physicians. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>}, for example

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is necessary to standardize the style of references. FOR EXAMPLE, VANCOUVER. References 6 {Campbell Systematic Reviews, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1230>} and 12 {In Annals of Internal Medicine (Vol. 169, number 7, pp. 467-473). American College of Physicians. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>}, for example

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequately reflects the content of the article. It precisely indicates the focus on clinical treatment prescription in physiotherapy and the scoping review approach, aligning well with the study's objectives and findings.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract clearly presents the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. It provides a concise and coherent summary of the study, allowing the reader to easily understand the purpose, approach, and key findings of the review.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Although there are minor grammatical and spelling errors, the overall quality of the English is good and the text is generally clear and understandable.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are clearly explained. The use of the PRISMA-ScR framework is appropriate for a scoping review and ensures transparency and methodological rigor in the study design.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are clearly presented and well-structured. It is particularly important to highlight that out of 37 identified records, only one met the inclusion criteria, which underscores the scarcity of explicit definitions and operational parameters in the literature. The use of the PRISMA flow diagram further strengthens the transparency of the study selection process.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate and well supported by the presented results. It appropriately reflects the key finding of the review, particularly the lack of explicit and operational definitions in the literature.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references appears to be comprehensive and appropriate, covering relevant databases and sources, including both scientific literature and institutional documents.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript addresses an important and underexplored topic in physiotherapy. It is well-structured and follows an appropriate methodological framework (PRISMA-ScR).
