

PART 1: Article Title: Perceived Sensory Challenges in Car Passengers: Implications for Occupational Performance, Occupational Therapy Interventions, and Mobility Equity

	Editor's comment	Author's comment (If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	This manuscript shows the connection between sensory processing and community travel in a car and how this can lead to feeling sick, which in turn can affect occupational function and performance. I could see this being relevant to OT in creating better positioning systems or routines that would assist with relaxation prior to car travel.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	I would drop "and Mobility Equity" from the title as it's mentioned one time in the discussion and it's not a significant issue within the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	I would suggest expanding the results section to discuss the percentage of participants that experienced symptoms that impacted their ADL function.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The content and structure of the language is sufficient and suitable for a scholarly article.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	I would have liked to have seen a longer discussion section, especially talking about the variability and subjective nature of car rides. I think this would be a good place to discuss more about common themes that emerged from the open-ended questions.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The reference section looks good as style is consistent with working doi links.	

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> No ethical issues were noted; IRB approval was listed.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	I found no competing interest issues in this manuscript.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No, I do not feel this manuscript is plagiarized.	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	No, I don't feel a disclaimer is warranted for this manuscript.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

"I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer." Dr. Randi Johnson Hanson PP-OTD, OTR/L

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript	8

<p>(Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)</p> <p>Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)</p>	
--	--