

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLISHING IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN JOURNAL OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

The South African Journal of Occupational Therapy (SAJOT) accepts scientific articles, scientific letters, scoping /systematic/integrative reviews, commentaries, opinion pieces and book reviews for publication.

The language of the Journal is South African English (abstracts may be provided in Afrikaans or the Vernacular as well as in English).

All articles that are published in SAJOT may be found at www.sajot.co.za, www.sceilo.org.za, EBSCOHost, Google Scholar or OT-DBASE. In addition, articles are preserved via Portico which is a digital preservation service provided by ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organisation with a mission to help the academic community use digital technologies to preserve the scholarly record and to advance research and teaching in sustainable ways.

POST-ACCEPTANCE PUBLICATION FEES:

In line with the policy of most Open Access Journals, all submissions to the SAJOT are subject to a publication fee of R5000-00 (Approx US\$350) per article once the submission is accepted for publication.

This post-acceptance publication fee will be applied to cover both retrospective and prospective processes involved in peer-reviewed articles, including:

- Peer-review management
- Manuscript preparation (e.g., copy editing)
- Journal production (e.g., layout)
- Open-access online publication and hosting
- Indexing (e.g., PubMed)
- Archiving

The fee is waived in the following instances:

- If at least one of the listed authors of the article is a member of the Occupational Therapy Association of Southern Africa (OTASA). (Proof of OTASA membership will be verified by the OT office prior to publication.)
- If an application for exemption is submitted and subsequently granted by the OTASA Chairman of the Publications Committee (see details below).
- If the submission is either a book-review, commentary or opinion piece.

Applications for exemption from the publication fee can be made to the chair of the publications committee Helen Buchanan (helen.buchanan@uct.ac.za)

Those authors eligible for payment of fees will receive an invoice from the OTASA office and payment will need to be made to OTASA within the stipulated time.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION

The following are included in these instructions:

1. General guidelines and instructions – procedure and presentation
2. Summary of Guidelines for authors
 - 2.1 Guidelines for authors of scientific articles
 - 2.2 Guidelines for authors of scientific letters
 - 2.3 Guidelines for publishing a literature, scoping or systematic review
 - 2.4 Guidelines for writing an opinion piece
 - 2.5 Guide to writing a commentary
 - 2.6 Instructions for reviewers of books
3. Guide to submitting an article online.

The relevant guidelines to authors (which follow) must be consulted for the layout and the format of the article, tables, diagrams and referencing.

I. GENERAL GUIDELINES & INSTRUCTIONS – PROCEDURE AND PRESENTATION (APPLICABLE TO ALL SUBMISSIONS)

- Manuscripts must be submitted via the SAJOT web site (www.sajot.co.za); the author must retain a copy of the script.
- **New authors must submit the title page of the submission to the editor at sajot@mweb.co.za. A username and**

password will then be provided to enable the author to complete the online article submission. (See Guide to submitting an article online). **Users already registered as authors do not need to go through a repeat of the registration process but simply use their existing username and password.**

- Users who are having problems with the username and password should contact the Editor-in-Chief at sajot@mweb.co.za.
- Please insert a note in the **'footer'** that gives the title of the article and the date at each submission. This is important for tracking purposes and will ensure that the correct version of the script is used for publication. This footnote will be removed at publication.
- Submission of the following separate files needs to be done.
 - The Manuscript (scientific article, scientific letter, scoping/systematic review, commentary, opinion piece) including the illustrations, tables, graphs.
 - 4 Supplementary files
 - A Title page
 - 10 multiple choice questions (MCQ's) (not for book reviews)
 - Contribution of Authors
 - Plagiarism Check report / certificate

The Manuscript

1. The manuscript needs to be uploaded first. This should include the abstract if applicable and all the illustrations, tables, graphs should be included in the correct place within the manuscript.
2. Please include the ethics clearance number if applicable to the study. The ethical clearance certificate must be available if requested. The ethical clearance number must also be recorded in the article when it is submitted for publication as part of the methodology section of the article.

Supplementary files

1. Title Page

Each Manuscript must include a separate Title Page loaded as a Supplementary File. When submitting the article do not include any author information on the article itself

This page must include:

The title of the article	
For each author	full name
	all academic degrees and where these were obtained
	present post held
	status as undergraduate student or postgraduate student at time of research and affiliation
	complete address
	telephone number
	e-mail address
	ORCID number
	HPCSA number and OTASA membership number if applicable
	Ethical clearance number – Institution where obtained
	Acknowledgments, sources of funding and conflict of interests
	Names and email address of suggested reviewers As a special request the author is asked to provide the names, place of work, and email contact details of two people who they believe have the skills and expertise to review the article

The **ORCID** number must also be recorded in the relevant place on the SAJOT web site when the article is being submitted using **http://**; and not **https://** on the electronic submission page. To obtain an ORCID reference number and to learn about the benefits of

being registered, go to: www.orcid.org. The ORCID number will be included as part of the metadata of your article when it goes to publication. Please check that the ORCID number resolves to the authors name.

2. Contribution of the authors

Contribution of the author in the manuscript/research process needs to be described in a separate document to be uploaded as a supplementary file. This is a requirement of SciELO.

3. The Multiple Choice questions (MCQs)

1. For CPD purposes 10 multiple choice questions need to be created based on the manuscript
2. The correct answers must be indicated on the document

4. Plagiarism Check report / certificate

'Cross Ref' or 'Turn-it-in' or 'Authenticate' certificate must be attached with an acceptable level (usually 15% or less depending on the use of terminology in the manuscript and less than 15 words combined in one sentence/paragraph)

Referencing

Vancouver style referencing is used and each reference in the text must be indicated by a number in the text. This number should be inserted in superscript without brackets e.g.¹². A reference list should be provided on a separate numbered page following the article text. References must be cited **in the order that they appear in the text**

ALL references must be linked through **CrossRef ie each reference must show its DOI number** (if it has one). To find the **DOI number** go to <https://search.crossref.org/>. Copy and paste or type in the title of the article or book and search. The full information on the article will appear. **Please note** that the DOI reference must be spaced so that it falls on one line and is not split between two lines. See examples of referencing below:

In **Mendeley** - the **Council of Science Editors – Citation Sequence (numeric)** provides the correct referencing. DOI numbers must be entered with the <http://dx.doi.org/> prefix into the Mendeley programme and these need to be linked in the reference list using CNTL K in the reference list. All **date of access, URLs and publishers** must be **removed** from Mendeley reference programme for journal articles.

In **Endnote** - use **Council of Science Editors (CSE)** or **PLOS** (you will need to change the style to remove brackets and superscript numbers –<https://libguides.library.cqu.edu.au/c.php?g=760903&p=6317474>) to provide the correct referencing. In endnote DOI numbers will also have to be added to references in Endnote with a <http://dx.doi.org/> or <https://doi.org/> prefix.

Examples of referencing

Journal article

Format: Author. Article title. Journal. Year; Volume (No): Page numbers. DOI number

Barnard-Ashton P, Adams F, Rothberg A, McInerney P. Digital apartheid and the effect of mobile technology during rural fieldwork. South African Journal of Occupational Therapy. 2018; 48(2): 20-25. doi:<http://doi.org/10.17159/23103833/2018/vol48n2a4>.

Journal names must be written out in full and capitalised but not italicised. Please note that this format must be used NOT doi:10.17159/23103833/2018/vol48n2a4,

Book

Format: Author(s). Book title. Edition. City: Publisher; Year. DOI if one is available

De Vos AS, Strydom H, Fouché CB, Delpont CSL. Research at Grass Roots: A primer for the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers; 2011. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hsag.v2i3.337>

Chapter (Section) in a Book

Format: Author(s). Chapter title. Book title. Editor. City: publisher; Date/Year published: page numbers. DOI number

Amis, M. Silk, M. Eisenhart, M. Freeman, K. deMarrais, J. Preissle, R. Roulston, E. St. Pierre, K. Howe, P. Lather, Y. Lincoln, G. C. In: Annella, D. Polkinghorne & H. Torrance. Chapter 10, Standards for Evaluating Qualitative Research. In: Understanding and Evaluating Qualitative Educational Research. M Lichtman, Editor. New York: Sage Knowledge; 2011: 253-260.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483349435.n10>

Webpages

Format: Author(s)(may be corporation or organisation).Name or title of webpage. the date accessed and the URL.

South African Government. Special Needs Education: Education White Paper 6. 2021 [accessed 2021 Jan 12]. <https://www.gov.za/documents/special-needs-education-education-white-paper-6>

General Requirements

	Abstract (words)	Pages	Tables and figures	Words (without tables and references)	References
Scientific Articles	200	± 16-19	8	5000- 7000	Max 35 for the literature review section. Max 60 references
Scientific Letters	n/a	± 5-8	2	1400-2500	Max 15
Integrative, Scoping or Systematic Review	200	± 16-19	8	5000- 7000	Max 60 references
Opinion Piece	200	± 5-8	2	1500-2000	Max 15
Commentary	200	± 5-8	2	1500-2000	Max 15
Book Reviews	n/a	n/a	n/a	500	

Manuscripts must be clearly typed in **MS Word 1.5.spacing with a legible font (Arial, size 11 is preferable). Set English (South Africa) as the default language.** Occupational therapy and occupational therapists should not be capitalised or abbreviated.

If quoting from a reference the following format must be used: Gibson^{2:30} stated that “Occupational therapy is an important service for the rehabilitation of persons suffering from HIV/AIDS”. where 2 is the reference number and 30 is the page number on which the quote appears

Tables should have the heading at the top of the table and labelled with Roman letters e.g. Table II.

Figures should be labelled at the bottom of the figure with Arabic numbers e.g. Figure. 2.

Tables and figures (which may include graphs) **should not be scanned** but formatted and included in place in the manuscript. Figures should be clear to the reader when photocopied.

Figures which consist of illustrations, diagrams or photographs may be of any size. They must be very sharp, taken close- up, and photographs should have a light over-all tone and without dark backgrounds. If the photograph, diagram and illustrations photocopy well, they will print well. Please check this before you send the manuscript.

The following web sites may be helpful for authors to consult either during the research process or during the write up process:

1. **Equator Network** (<http://www.equator-network.org/>), a database library that allows you to find and use reporting guidelines for different study designs. Provides a decision tree and examples that assist you with choosing the most appropriate reporting guideline for your study.
2. Typeset (<https://www.typeset.io/>), an online research communication platform that autoformats documents and helps ensure they are 100% compliant with journal submission guidelines.
3. Authoraid (<http://www.authoraid.info/en/>), a free global network that provides online mentoring, collaboration, and support for researchers in low and middle-income countries.
4. Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations (https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/full-text/2014/09000/standards_for_reporting_qualitative_research__a.21.aspx)

Review of submissions

All manuscripts undergo an anonymous double blind peer review process. The reviewers are required to comment on the scientific worth of the article and its suitability for publication in SAJOT. (To ensure a blind review see section below). The comments are returned to the authors by the editor with a directive for further action required. Articles may be accepted without change, changes may be requested or the article may be rejected.

Editing

Please note that the article will be checked by the Editor and the English Language editor and when necessary, the author(s) before going to print.

Intellectual Property and Copyright

The author retains intellectual property rights over original material, in keeping with South African IP legislation and the policy of the employing body/training institution where relevant. SAJOT adheres to Creative Commons licensing as follows:

All work is published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Non Commercial International Creative Commons (CC-BY-NC – ND 4.0) License. Under this license, authors agree to make articles available to users, without permission or fees, for any lawful, non-commercial purpose. Users may read, copy, or re-use published content provided that the author and original place of publication are properly cited. See <http://userguide.sajot.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/FINALPublication-Ethics-Practice-comments.pdf>

Checking the Manuscript before Submission

Confirmation that the following items have been attended to will be required as part of the submission process.

- The submission has not been previously published, nor has it been submitted to another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in Comments to the Editor).
- The submission file is in Microsoft Word file format.
- All references have been checked to see that they comply with the requirements (see References above).
- The text is Arial 11, 1.5 spaced; employs italics, rather than underlining (except with URL addresses); and all figures and tables have been placed in the text.
- The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined above
- The instructions for Ensuring a Blind Review have been followed.
- A colleague has read the article to provide objective peer input, inconsistencies, spelling and grammar in addition to running a spell-check with English, South Africa as the default setting. Authors for whom English is a second language should have their article edited by a professional English-language editor or editing service. During the review process, articles may be returned to the author to arrange such a service, if improvements to language and clarity are required.
- 10 Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs) based on the article content are prepared in the supplementary file section of the article submission. In addition, it is advisable to email these to the managing editor at sajot@mweb.co.za. **NB The article will not be sent for review until these have been received or posted on the web site.**
- The details of all the authors have been included in the submission.
- Ethical approval for the study has been sought and explained in the article and an approval number is given but the institution where obtained is replaced by XXX to ensure a blind review.
- The title of the article is on the article submission- see Title page
- The abstract has separately been included in the submission block on the webpage and is also included in the **Manuscript**.
- The article has undergone a **plagiarism check**.
- Permission has been obtained from the co-authors to publish the article and to use their names.
- The relevant acknowledgements have been provided at the end of the manuscript.
- As a special request the author is asked to provide the names, place of work, and email contact details of two people who they believe have the skills and expertise to review the article.

Ensuring a blind review

To ensure the integrity of the blind peer review of the submission to this journal, every effort is made to prevent the identities of the authors and reviewers from being known to each other.

It is the primarily the duty of the author to remove any possible identification from the text submitted as indicated below. The reviewer is obliged to keep his/her comments/opinions about the article confidential and communicate these only to the editor; should the reviewer have prior knowledge of or involvement with (incidental or otherwise) the author or the article in question, the editor should be informed of the situation and the situation reviewed if needed.

The editor is the only person who has access to all the information about authors and reviewers. Any issues concerning a review / edit/ authorship / copyright etc. about a SAJOT submission must be brought to the attention of the editor directly – the editor is the only person authorised to deal with these issues and will do so in a strictly confidential manner.

This process applies to the authors, editors and reviewers (who upload documents as part of their review), checking to see that the following steps have been taken with regard to the text and the file properties:

- The authors of the document have deleted their names from the text, and substituted “Author”. . This includes ensuring that the names used in the acknowledgements section have also been substituted with an X. Names will be inserted just prior to publication.
- With Microsoft Office documents, author identification should also be removed from the properties of the file.

For **Microsoft 2010-2019**(Windows):

- Under the File menu select “Info”.
- Click on the “Inspect Document” icon.
- Uncheck all the checkboxes except “Document Properties and Personal information”.

- Run the document inspector, which will then do a search of the document properties and indicate if any document property fields contain any information.
- If the document inspector finds that some of the document properties contain information it will notify you and give you the option to “Remove all,” which you will click to remove the document properties and personal information from the document.

For **MacIntosh Word** (and future versions)

- Under the File menu select “Properties.”
- Under the Summary tab remove all of the identifying information from all of the fields.
- Save the File.
- For **PDF files:**
- With PDFs, the authors’ names should also be removed from Document Properties found under File on Adobe Acrobat’s main menu.

Continuing education points

CEU points are accredited as follows:

- PrincipalCEUs for authors of a scientific article, scoping/systematic/integrative review: , Principal author of a scientific article or literature review (15 CEUs) and co-authors (5 CEUs.).
- Principal authorsAuthors of scientific letters, commentaries, book reviews or opinion pieces: (5 CEU’s) and co-authors (3 CEU’s).

2. SUMMARY OF GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES

Articles submitted to the SAJOT must be original and must not have been published elsewhere. Articles should contain new information, add to existing knowledge, resolve controversy or provoke thought and discussion. The content of the article must justify the length, which should be about **16-19 pages** (between **5000- 7000 words**).

Authors should consult the article “The pitfalls of “salami slicing”: focus on quality not quantity of publications” by Fenseca M. Editage Insights. Nov 4; 2013.<https://www.editage.com/insights/the-pitfalls-of-salami-slicing-focus-on-quality-and-not-quantity-of-publications>

Abstract and Key Words

The article must be accompanied by an abstract not exceeding 200 words in length. The abstract must contain a succinct structured summary of the study- headings may be used in the abstract (introduction, methodology, results, conclusion). There should be no references or abbreviations in the abstract.

Key words: a list of “key words” which contain words that might be helpful for tracking your article. Try not to ‘repeat’ key words from the title of the article, as this will limit the search opportunities.

Introduction

This should provide a brief rationale for the study and an outline of the aims or questions. The introduction should present a clear indication of the need for and purpose addressed by the article. Authors should not assume that the readers know the **context** in which the article is set. The content needs to be organised in a coherent and logical manner and may require concise descriptions and definitions of terms to elucidate the content as well as the aim of the study. The literature review may be included in the introduction.

Literature Review

A separate review of the **relevant literature** can be provided. This should be a **critical** appraisal of the current relevant literature identifying the limitations in the work already conducted on the subject and a rationale for the study. **A maximum of 35** references should be included.

The aim or objectives of the study should appear at the end of the literature review

Method

The section on **research methods** should include if appropriate according to the Equator Network and may include:

- the research design used,
- the population and manner of selecting the population sample,
- the research tools used,
- the method of data collection,
- the methods used to analyse the data including details of the statistical methods, information on validity, reliability, trustworthiness and credibility.

Details of the ethical clearance and informed consent must be provided without the name of the institution at this stage (replace name with XXXX)

Results/Findings

The results must be presented in a way that makes them accessible to the readers and are clearly linked to the aims and methods of the research.

Discussion

The discussion should summarise the main findings and explore the reasons for these. New knowledge must be highlighted, and the limitations of the study given. The implications for occupational therapists and or other health professionals/groups/ contexts must be outlined and the contribution that the study makes to the current state of knowledge of the profession/s stated. Limitations must also be discussed.

Conclusion

The conclusion must be brief, drawing the article to a close by relating the results to the aim of the research and indicating the key findings this research has added.

Acknowledgements and conflict of interests

All assistance and funding for the research must be acknowledged and any conflict of interests stated.

Tables and figures

Articles may include up to **eight (8) tables or figures** and should be numbered and **clearly labelled and included in the manuscript** in the appropriate place.

2.2 GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS OF SCIENTIFIC LETTERS

Letters submitted to the SAJOT must be original and must not have been published elsewhere. Letters should contain new information, add to existing knowledge, resolve controversy or provoke thought and discussion. Use the outline of the scientific article as a guide.

Requirements

The requirements of a scientific letter are as follows:

- The letter must have the same scientific format as an article, but should be much shorter -. **1400 – 2500 words**, to fill only a few pages of the Journal but does not have an abstract.
- It may have only **two (2) tables** of results.
- There should not be more than **15 references**.
- It must be original research.

Peer evaluation will take place as with all other articles submitted to SAJOT.

2.3 GUIDELINES FOR PUBLISHING AN INTEGRATIVE, SCOPING OR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Integrative, scoping reviews and systematic reviews submitted to the SAJOT must be original and must not have been published elsewhere. The content of the article must justify the length, which should be about **16-19 pages, with 1.5 spacing (5000-7000 words)**

Follow the PRISMA requirements/guidelines for when submitting an integrative, scoping or systematic review. The manuscript should contain the following:

Title

The title must be concise enough to reflect the 'Population', 'Concept', and 'Context' (PCC) of the review, which are the elements of a scoping review used to establish a priori inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Abstract and Key Words

The review must be accompanied by an abstract not exceeding 200 words in length. The abstract must contain a succinct structured summary of the study- headings may be used in the abstract (background, aim, methods, results, conclusion). There should be no references or abbreviations in the abstract.

Key words: a list of "key words" which contain words that might be helpful for tracking your article. Try not to 'repeat' key words from the title of the article, as this will limit the search opportunities.

Background

The background of the review should be comprehensive and should cover the main elements of the topic, important definitions, and the existing knowledge in the field. An integrative review would identify and organise a combination of diverse methodologies into themes or a framework to provide a more comprehensive understanding of a particular phenomenon whereas a scoping review would examine and map emerging evidence (may or may not have a quality appraisal) and a systematic review would identify, appraise and synthesise existing evidence.

Arksey, H. and O'Malley, L., 2005. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), pp.19-32.

Munn, Z., Peters, M.D., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A. and Aromataris, E., 2018. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC medical research methodology*, 18(1), pp.1-7.

Peters, M.D., Marnie, C., Tricco, A.C., Pollock, D., Munn, Z., Alexander, L., McInerney, P., Godfrey, C.M. and Khalil, H., 2020. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JB Evidence Synthesis*, 18(10), pp.2119-2126.

Khalil, H., Peters, M.D., Tricco, A.C., Pollock, D., Alexander, L., McInerney, P., Godfrey, C.M. and Munn, Z., 2021. Conducting high quality scoping reviews-challenges and solutions. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 130, pp.156-160.

Pollock, D., Davies, E.L., Peters, M.D., Tricco, A.C., Alexander, L., McInerney, P., Godfrey, C.M., Khalil, H. and Munn, Z., 2021. Undertaking a scoping review: A practical guide for nursing and midwifery students, clinicians, researchers, and academics. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*.

Whittemore, R. and Knafl, K., 2005. The integrative review: updated methodology. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 52(5), pp.546-553.

Review question/objective

The review objective(s) must be clearly stated. The objective will guide the scope of the enquiry.

Method

Include the framework on which the review was based. Depending on the framework headings may include –

- Inclusion and exclusion criteria (PCC)
- Search strategy,
- Study selection,
- Extracting and charting the results,
- Validity

Results

This section should present the main evidence and a summary of the framework, studies or quality of research.

Discussion

This section should outline the implications of the findings for occupational therapy practice, the methodological limitations of the review, identify gaps in the literature and recommend future action.

Conclusion

A clear summary of the main findings should be provided.

Illustrations

Articles may include up to **eight (8) tables or figures** and should be numbered and clearly labelled with their place in the text indicated as a guide to the editor. These must include a diagram of the search strategy as well as a summary of the articles/ publications included in the review.

2.4 GUIDELINES FOR WRITING AN OPINION PIECE

Opinion pieces provide authors with the opportunity to express an opinion concerning any aspect of occupational therapy. They are designed to encourage topical debate and the exchange of ideas. Contributors may discuss specific aspects of occupational therapy practice or debate the impact of occupational therapy on the health of people. Opinion Pieces may also deal with health care and relevant social practice/issues in general such as consumer rights that may impact on the profession. They may also debate the impact of the current political and financial climate on the practice of the profession and its ability to meet all in need.

The following provides some guidance:

- Focus tightly on the issue or idea — in your first paragraph. Be brief.
- Express your opinion, and then base it on factual, researched or first-hand information.
- Be timely, controversial, but not outrageous. Be the voice of reason.
- Be personal and conversational; it can help you make your point. No one likes a stuffed shirt.
- Be humorous, provided that your topic lends itself to humour. Irony can also be effective.
- Have a clear editorial viewpoint – come down hard on one side of the issue. Do not equivocate.
- Provide insight, understanding; educate your reader without being preachy.
- Near the end, clearly re-state your position and issue a call to action. Do not philosophise.
- Have verve, and “fire in the gut” indignation to accompany your logical analysis.
- Do not ramble or let your piece unfold slowly, as in an essay.
- Use clear, powerful, direct language.
- Avoid clichés and jargon.
- Appeal to the average reader. Clarity is paramount.

1. **Collect research to support your opinion.** Make sure that your supporting statements match the topic. You should include examples and evidence that demonstrate a real understanding of your topic. This includes any potential counterclaims. To truly understand what you are arguing for or against, it is imperative that you understand the opposing arguments of your topic.
2. **Acknowledge the previous opinions or arguments that have been made.** More than likely you are writing about a controversial topic that has been debated before. Look at the arguments made in the past and see how they fit in with your opinion in the context in which you are writing. How is your point of view similar or different from previous debaters? Has something changed in the time others were writing about it and now? If not, what does lack of change mean?
3. **Use a transition statement that shows how your opinion adds to the argument or suggests those previous statements and arguments are incomplete or faulty.** Follow up with a statement that expresses your opinion.
4. **Next, list supporting evidence to back up your position.** It is important to keep the tone of your essay professional, by avoiding emotional language and any language that expresses an accusation. Use factual statements that are supported by sound evidence.
5. **Note:** Any time you develop an argument, you should start by thoroughly researching your opposition's point of view. This will help you to anticipate any potential holes or weaknesses in your own opinion or argument.
6. **Lastly there must be a conclusion** in which you restate your opinion using different words.

In summary: Irrespective of the topic discussed, opinions should be supported by evidence or theory. They should include:

- An abstract (**200 words**)
- Headings which give structure to the paper (**1400-2000 words**)
- References (**a maximum of 15**).

Opinion pieces are subject to the same critical review process as other submissions.

The following references were consulted and the information incorporated into the above guidelines:

- Shapiro S. 10 Rules For Writing Opinion Pieces. *Writer's Digest*. July, 2009. www.writersdigest.com/writing-articles/by-writing-goal/improve-my-writing/10-rules-for-writing-opinion-pieces.
- Astone. Ten tips to write an opinion piece people read. *Climate system science*. Australian Government, 2010 <https://www.climate-science.org.au/content/1053-ten-tips-write-opinion-piece-people-read>. (Sept 2010).
- Opinion Essays. *Academic writing*. <http://academicwriting.wikidot.com/opinion-essays>

Opinions are not necessarily those of the Occupational Therapy Association of South Africa nor SAJOT but never-the-less may provide information for debate.

2.5 GUIDELINES FOR WRITING A COMMENTARY

These are similar to opinion pieces, but a commentary is written on a current event or topic by a person with the background to make an informed comment and should report on an issue or topic of interest and relevance to OT practitioners, educators and researchers.

Commentaries usually bring to the attention of the reader new ideas and advances in a particular subject or field of practice. In this case the commentary will compare past practices and new ideas and will point out any research related to it. The commentary may also present criticism of the new in relation to the old or vice versa. Personal experiences with the new can also be presented and add to the discussion. Commentaries do not include original data or the research findings of the author but are dependent on the author's perspective.

The commentary will also examine the way in which the subject or intervention can be applied to local settings and circumstances and comment on the value that the new idea may have in relation to the past. A final statement or conclusion must be provided ie there must be a "take home" message.

Irrespective of the information being commented upon, commentaries (1400-2000 words) should include:

- An abstract (**200 words**)
- Introduction
- Coherent body with headings that give structure to the paper
- Recommendations and conclusion
- References (**a maximum of 15**)

Commentaries are subject to the same critical review process that other submissions undergo.

The following reference was consulted while drawing up these guidelines:

- Berterö C. Guidelines for writing a commentary. Int J Qual Stud Health Well-being. 2016; 11:10. <https://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v11.31390>

2.6 INSTRUCTIONS FOR BOOK REVIEWS

A book review (**500 words**) should contain the following information:

- The full title of the book.
- The full name of the author(s) and their qualifications and the position that they hold.
- Details of the book:
 - Name of publisher
 - Whether it is a paperback or hard copy and the number of pages
 - The publication date
 - The ISBN number
 - The price (in South African Rand if possible)
- A review of the content, which should include:
 - The aim of the book
 - The way in which the information is structured
 - A brief summary of the content of each chapter
 - A comment on its relevance to health care generally and SA occupational therapy specifically.
- The name, qualifications and work position of the reviewer.

3. GUIDE TO SUBMITTING AN ARTICLE ONLINE

The Guide to submitting an article online is featured under the tab Guide for authors in the header of the SAJOT web site.

Prepare the article as described above.

The following are the steps to follow:

Go to www.sajot.co.za. Log in using the “username” and “password” that has been given to you. Click on the tab “New Submission”. The following are the steps as enumerated on the web site:

Step 1 – Starting the submission

Journal section

Select the relevant category of the submission in this section from the drop-down box.

Submission check list

Ensure that you, the author, have done **ALL** the things mentioned in the submission check list and confirm this by placing a check in the relevant box. See the section **Checking the manuscript before submission**. Please note that failure to comply with all the items mentioned could result in the article being returned to you and thus an unnecessary delay in the publication process.

Copyright notice

Click to accept the copyright provisions as seen on the web site.

You may also send a note to the editor in the box provided.

Click save **and continue** at the bottom of the page, this will enable you to move on to the next stage of the submission process.

Step 2 – Upload the submission

Follow the steps for uploading your article.

Upload manuscript file

NB it is important that you upload the file containing the complete article here. Do not include any information about the authors on the article.

To upload – Click on the browse button, locate the file containing the article on your computer, click on it so that the name of the file appears in the window, and then click the upload button. This is the only place where the main article can be uploaded.

Click **save and continue**.

Step 3 – Entering the submissions metadata:

Authors– Information about **all** the authors must be provided here.

The bio statement box should be used to complete the details of all the qualifications of the authors (i.e. degree and where obtained) as well as the place of work and position held. Please include each author’s ORCID number in the relevant box using the prefix <https://doi.org>.

Title and abstract – Please copy / type in the full title of your article into the box provided. Paste in a copy of the abstract into the block provided.

Indexing – ignore this section.

Supporting agencies – complete if relevant e.g. funding organisation.

Click **save and continue**

Step 4 – Uploading supplementary information:

Please note that there are two steps here:

Step 4 and Step 4a. In step 4 all four (4) Supplementary files must be uploaded: a title page, plagiarism report, the MCQs, and a document outlining the role of the authors and any other information that you wish to give the editor. Each file is uploaded separately and saved. Click save and continue to upload each file which will bring up step 4a where you can add the information needed to identify the supplementary information. The only compulsory window is the title window.

Click save and continue. This will bring you back to step 4 again where another file can be uploaded. Each supplementary piece of information is added as new file

Step 5 – Confirming the Submission

Click **Finish Submission**. Please remember to do this otherwise your submission will not be recorded. It is very important to note that once you have confirmed the submission you will be unable to make changes to your main document. However, you will be able to add supplementary files. This should be done before the article is sent into the review stage by the editor.

Any changes that you wish to make to the article itself will need to be done via a completely new submission.

Resubmission of Manuscript after Desk Edit

The article will be desk edited by the journal editor after submission. The article may be returned to you by email within a week to amend issues such as formatting, referencing and obvious issues with content. The article or may require major revision or be rejected at this stage if it is not suitable for SAJOT.

If there are issues that need to be addressed before the manuscript can be sent for peer review and you should be complete these and return the manuscript to the editor by email as soon as possible (2 weeks) so the review process can start.

Resubmission of Article after Revisions/Amendments

The outcome of the review will be emailed to you and will be available on the SAJOT webpage under **Review** on your article page. **A list of changes made or highlighted changes in the text of the article must be included so revisions can be reviewed or edited.** The article should be resubmitted within 4 weeks.

Once the author has dealt with these amendments suggested by the editor, a new version of the article must be uploaded. Scroll to the section at the bottom of the Review page of your article to the section labelled **Editor Decision**. There you will see the box **Upload author version**. Please post your revised copy here -.

Help with this submission process can be obtained by emailing the managing editor at www.sajot.co.za.