

Guideline for World Physiotherapy Congress 2025 reviewers

Managing conflicts of interest

This guideline is designed to help identify and manage any conflicts of interest relating to the organisation of World Physiotherapy Congress 2025.

World Physiotherapy relies on volunteer reviewers to peer-review content submitted for inclusion in the congress scientific programme. This may include submissions for focused symposia, abstracts, and clinical seminars. World Physiotherapy recognises these reviewers may be engaged, as a result of their professional work, in a number of contractual, consulting, and advisory relationships. This is acknowledged as essential to the contributions they make to practice, research, education, and professional development.

Reviewers are expected to carry out their duties in the best interests of World Physiotherapy, ensuring fair, robust and ethically sound peer-review.

Definition

Conflicts of interest may arise where there is a conflict between the responsibilities of a reviewer and any other interests they may have. For example, where the reviewer could be seen to be influencing World Physiotherapy and congress matters for actual or potential personal and/or professional benefit. Such a conflict arises, for instance, when a reviewer is in a position to influence, directly or indirectly, World Physiotherapy or congress business in ways that could lead to gain for them, and/or their institution, to the detriment of World Physiotherapy's integrity, its mission and policies, or the reputation of its congress. There are situations in which financial or other personal considerations may compromise, or could be perceived as compromising, a reviewer's professional judgement.

Examples of a potential conflict of interest:

- personal or professional relationships that might enable a reviewer to influence the congress programme leading to inappropriate gain for the reviewer, relative, or colleague, eg through involvement with a project or colleague's work that they are subsequently asked to review.
Note: knowing a person does not constitute a conflict
- they are named on the submission as an organiser, chair, speaker, or author
- the abstract support programme and review processes are entirely separate. Therefore, if a reviewer also acted as a supporter, they must not review any abstract on which they provided feedback.

Note: other potential conflicts may exist. The above is intended as an aid to understanding what may or may not be a potential conflict.

Management

The online review systems have been set up to handle potential conflicts of interest.

a) where a potential conflict of interest is identified the reviewer should not review the proposal and indicate the conflict via the online review system.

b) the proposal will then be assigned to an alternative reviewer.