

	<b>Editor's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> ( <i>If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here</i> )
<p>Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer</p>	<p>I agree that this topic has limited exploration. However, I don't see it as a pressing topic for the scientific community. There is an extreme amount of variability when it comes to individuals and how their bodies are impacted after a car ride? (do they have pre-existing medical conditions that influence their symptoms, length of the car trip, were they front seat or back seat passengers, are they 6 ft 5 and forced to ride passenger in a convertible, were they physically active for several hours prior to riding in the car which may influence symptoms, do they work at a computer for eight hours (influencing eye strain) and are picked up for a ride home.....the list goes on</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?</p>	<p>Exploring perceived sensory and physiological challenges experienced by car passengers: Implications for occupational therapy intervention</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions</p>	<p>No. The background could use some statistical data to emphasize the need of this study exploration. Method-specify the survey type, # of questions in survey, type of survey. Results-include some of your statistical results to paint a picture for and engage your potential reader. I recommend writing your abstract in narrative form.</p>	
<p>Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Please provide your comments regarding the</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b>-How would home-based rehabilitation services impact a potential passenger client? I can see how an</p>	

<p>appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.</p>	<p>individual receiving outpatient services may be impacted. <b>Recommendation</b> for sentence, “this can lead to” Subsequently, these unanticipated changes; <b>Question</b> for sentence, “transportation is a social” to How does this statement relate to your topic? Transportation as a social determinate of health is related more to lack of accessibility and affordability. This statement seems out of place for your narrative. <b>Observation</b>-the sentence beginning with sensory conflict theory is unclear and may need rewording</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Did you mention the patterns that were derived from the qualitative portion of your investigation?</p>	
<p>Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.</p>	<p>yes</p>	

**PART 1: Article Title:**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Editor’s comment</b>	
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i></p> <p>no</p>	
<p><b>Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>no</p>	
<p><b>Do you think the article is plagiarized?</b> If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.</p>	<p>no</p>	
<p><b>Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the</b></p>	<p>no</p>	

<p><b>history of this manuscript?</b> (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)</p>		
--	--	--

**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. I have no competing interest as a reviewer..

**PART 4: Objective Evaluation:**

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
<p>Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript ( Highest: 10 Lowest: 0 )</p> <p><b>Guideline:</b> Accept As It Is: (&gt;9-10) Minor Revision: (&gt;8-9) Major Revision: (&gt;7-8) Serious Major revision: (&gt;5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (&gt;3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (&gt;0-3)</p>	<p><b>Rejected (with reconsideration) 4</b> The concept of this article is interesting. However, there are to many variable components that can impact the car passenger experience. Maybe consider streamlining the focus. The pre-trip and post-trip suggestions were great. I recommend using a smaller sample size of car passengers who can identify any changes impacting their trips using the recommendations-before and after. Or maybe focus on passengers known physiological or sensory issues with attention paid to their medical limitations of course.</p>