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**Reviewer’s report:**

Thank you very much for inviting me to review this interesting manuscript. Describing the development of inherent requirement statements for a physiotherapy program, I think, it addresses an important yet new issue in the field of physiotherapy that will encourage students with disability participate in their courses. However, I would not classify this paper under technical advance category rather than research report, as it is kind of a case report about the experience of one academic institution.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1- I think the manuscript does not fully reflect the title of the paper. A suggested title could include Australia, and/or students with disability

2- Abstract:
Overall, the abstract is an excellent and complete summary, with these exceptions:
   a. Not structured according to the journal’s style.
   b. Context could be replaced with background
   c. Methods could be shortened
   d. Conclusion is important to be included into the abstract section

3- Background:
   a. The authors state that “one third of Australian universities provide generic information on the requirements of physiotherapy study” without providing a reference(s).
   b. I would like to know about the percentage of students with disability admitted into physiotherapy schools in Australia and globally.
   c. I would like to know if the World Confederation of Physical Therapy (WCPT) has any input on this issue, especially in their recent guidelines about physical therapy education.

4- Method:
The overall methods appear reasonable, but there is no discussion of some of the questions that might be raised such as:
a. Was there any published article discussed the advantages of using framework or model in developing new policy or statement, as the author build on the method used for the IRON framework.

b. Lack of information about the history of the physiotherapy program at the University of Western Sydney; and the difference between Bachelor of Health Science and Master of Physiotherapy programs

5- Results:

a. The results were not clearly explained and presented the 15 inherent requirements in an appropriate format.

b. It did not include some details that found in the abstract (under results) but not here.

c. It is always good to provide a link to the university website, and how these requirements presented for the students, but not sure if it could be readable for students with vision impairments.

6- Discussion and Conclusions:

a. The authors started that this paper was synthesized systematically-collected data from different sources without writing about the search strategies in the method section. It might be useful starting with this statement if the study was designed as a qualitative systemic review.

b. The findings not properly described in the context of the published literature.

c. No limitations of the study were discussed, especially about using a pre-existing framework.

d. The authors’ conclusions were appropriate.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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