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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:
Overall, this study addresses relevant literature and adds value to the research base. It is generally well written and well constructed. Throughout the manuscript, the term 'medical information' is used consistently. With physiotherapy, is the term 'medical information' appropriate? A lot of clinical information is not medical in nature therefore the authors should consider using a different term especially for an international readership.
Line 15 page 4 - please reconsider. 'deal with medical information'. Again on line 24. "deal with".
Page 5 line 3-4 you state that physiotherapists more align with a BPS approach. The references you have given are 1994 and 2000. Furthermore, there is a plethora of literature to
suggest that physiotherapy practice is more aligned with a BM approach. This needs to be considered in your argument and included.

Page 5 line 9 "deal with". Please reconsider better use of English language. "Deal with" is getting repetitive and doesn't convey the message well.

Limitations need to be further developed and outlined. Consider the single university site and country for example.

Page 11 line 19 "deal with". Please consider alternatives.

Conclusion - there are implications outlined in the conclusion (line 1 page 12). Please consider further developing this within the discussion section. consider moving this and outlining as an implication.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Please refer to suggestions listed above - especially those related to further developing the implications

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Please review those mentioned above. Thanks

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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