



## GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING A MANUSCRIPT:

Please see instructions for ensuring a blind review under the Instructions to Authors.

### 1. ACCEPTING THE REVIEW

Please think about the following before accepting a manuscript for review:

Are there any conflicting interests?
Will you be able to provide feedback within the allocated time?
Will you be able to be objective and constructive in <i>(your)</i> review?
Will you be able to respect the confidentiality of the peer review process

Please follow the following steps to access the manuscript if you agree with the above

#### Steps in the review process

1. On receiving the invitation to review an article, log on to the SAJOT web site using the username and password that was allocated to you when you were invited to become a reviewer. This will be the same one used for submitting an article to SAJOT.
2. The abstract of the article will be attached to the email. Peruse this abstract to determine whether the article falls within your area of interest/expertise and whether you would be able to conduct the review within the timeframe stated.
3. Click on the “active” button against the subheading reviewer. This will bring up the title of the article. Click on this title to get access to the article. This will bring up the review page with all the information about the article.
4. Scroll down to the heading “**Review steps**”
  - **Item one** - the place where you need to inform the editor of your decision. It is important that you respond to the request to review the manuscript within one week. Should you not be able to complete the review within the specified time limit of 4 weeks, please inform the editor immediately so that another reviewer may be appointed. This will prevent undue delays in processing the article
  - **Item 2** – indicates that you should access the general review instructions as well as those specific to the type of article that you are reviewing e.g. Scientific Article, Commentary,, Opinion Piece etc. These can be found at the bottom of the Review page or in the toolbar at the heading on the Home Page.
  - **Item 3** gives you access to the article. Click on the number that you see, and the article will be downloaded.
  - **Item 4** Once you have reviewed the article you should complete the review form by clicking on the ‘Review Form’ icon to access the form.

- **Item 5** is where you upload the article once you have completed the comments that have been made via track changes . In the process of making comments directly onto the article, it is important that you look at the requirements for a “blind review” and ensure that you have met these requirements. Please change the name on your track changes to ‘REVIEWER’ or ‘REV’ so a blind review is maintained to conceal your identity.
  - **Item 6.** Once items 1 through 5 have been completed, please choose an option from the drop-down box and click on the tab “Submit review to editor”. This is a very important step in the review process
5. **It is extremely important that you complete the review within the allotted time i.e., 1 month.**

## 2. THE REVIEW PROCESS

### 1. General guidelines for reviewing a manuscript

	Comments if needed
1. Declare any potential conflicting interests	
2. Will you be able to provide feedback within the allocated time?	
3. Respect the confidentiality of peer review process	
4. Do not share the manuscript with colleagues unless the Editor has given the green light” <sup>2</sup> .	
5. Do not use information obtained during the peer-review process for your own or any other advantage	
6. Be objective and constructive in <i>(your)</i> review	
7. Please make use of the “track changes” function to add your comments to the manuscript (ANONYMISED)	
8. Include details of what is good about the article, but also highlight any problems	

## 3. GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A REVIEW

### 3a SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

#### 2. Appropriateness of the article

	YES	NO	Comments
--	-----	----	----------

1. The article is <b>appropriate for the journal</b> and its readers. Is the message appropriate to OT's?			
2. Does this manuscript address a problem that is of <b>interest, import and relevant</b> to readers of this journal?			
3. <b>Title:</b> this is concise and reflects the contents of the article			
4. The <b>abstract</b> provides appropriate information, is a true reflection of the content of the paper and provides a summary of the full research process. The points under 'Implications for Practice' are concise and not a repetition of aspects mentioned in the 'Conclusions' section.			
5. Are there any <b>inconsistencies</b> between the abstract and the text?			
6. <b>Introduction:</b> Is there a clear, concise background to the study?			
7. <b>Literature review:</b> Is the literature review complete and provide satisfactory citation of recent research in the area?			
8. Does the introduction build a logical case for the <b>problem statement</b> ?			
9. Is the <b>research question/aim</b> clear and concise?			

### 3. Methodology

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Is the approach/paradigm/ <b>study design</b> appropriate for the study?			
2. Are the <b>methods clearly</b> described in such a way that it can be replicated?			
3. Is the <b>population</b> described in detail?			
4. Is the <b>sample and criteria for selection/exclusion</b> clearly described?			

5. Is the <b>method of data collection</b> described in detail?			
6. Was an appropriate <b>data collection tool/method</b> used and described in detail?			
7. For <b>quantitative studies</b> : Are issues of validity and internal and external reliability addressed?			
8. For <b>qualitative studies</b> : Are issues of confirmability, generalisability, transferability, and credibility addressed?			
9. Is the <b>data analysis process</b> and software used described and cited correctly?			
10. Does this study have <b>ethical approval</b> ?			

#### 4. Results

	YES	N O	Comments
1. Are the results <b>clearly organised</b> ?			
2. Are the <b>key results discussed</b> ?			
3. Are there <b>inconsistencies or errors</b> in the reporting of the results?			
4. Do <b>figures, graphs, tables clearly describe</b> the appropriate findings?			
5. For <b>qualitative studies</b> : Are the participant quotes labelled with at least 2 anonymised identifiers?			
6. Have the authors <b>answered their research question</b> using the stated research methods?			

## 5. Discussion & Conclusion

	YES	N O	Comments
1. Did the author <b>summarise the key findings</b> ?			
2. Is the Interpretation of results correct?			
3. Are results compared to existing literature?			
4. Do the authors acknowledge all the limitations of the study?			
5. Are the conclusions consistent with the design, methods used, and results obtained in the study?			
6. Is the Key 'take home 'message included?			
7. Are future implications of the findings included?			

## 6. References

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Latest articles/up to date references were included			
2. Articles were cited correctly			
3. The correct citation style was used			
4. All DOIs of references (where available) are listed in the required format			

## 7. Technical issues

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Key terms were correct			
2. Logical flow of text			
3. Grammatical/technical issues			

### 3b. REVIEWING A SCIENTIFIC LETTER

Use the guidelines for a Scientific article above to review the lay-out and format of the Letter.

- No abstract or separate literature review is required

- Word limit is 1400 – 2500 words,.
- It may have a maximum of two (2) tables.
- There should not be more than 15 references

### 3c. REVIEWING A SCOPING OR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

	YES	NO	Comments
1. The scoping /systematic review is appropriate for the journal and its readers. Is the message appropriate to OT's?			
2. Does this manuscript address a problem that is of interest, import and relevant to readers of this journal?			
3. Title: this is concise and reflects the contents of the scoping /systematic review			
4. The abstract provides appropriate information, is a true reflection of the content of the paper and provides a summary of the full scoping /systematic review process			
5. Are there any inconsistencies between the abstract and the text?			
6. Introduction: Is there a clear, concise background to the scoping /systematic review?			
7. Literature review: Is the literature review complete and provide satisfactory citation of recent research in the area?			

8. Is there a logical rationale for the scoping /systematic review?			
9. Is the review question/aim/objectives clear and concise?			

## 2 Methodology

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Is the scoping /systematic review design appropriate for the study?			
2. Are the methods clearly described in such a way that it can be replicated?			
3. Are the eligibility criteria described in detail? (Population, constructs, context)			
4. Is the search strategy clearly described			
5. Is the screening and selection described in detail? (Prisma diagram)			
6. Was an appropriate data extraction method used and described in detail?			
7. Is the data analysis process employed adequately described?			

## 3 Results

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Are the results clearly organised?			

2. Are the key characteristics of included sources, evidence or review findings appropriately discussed?			
3. Are there inconsistencies or errors in the reporting of the results?			
4. Do figures, graphs, tables clearly describe the appropriate findings?			
5. Have the authors answered their research question using the stated research methods?			
6. The tables and figures should be inserted in the appropriate position in the text			

### 1. Discussion & Conclusion

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Did the author summarise the key findings?			
2. Is the Interpretation of results correct?			
3. Are results compared to existing literature?			
4. Do the authors acknowledge all the limitations of the study?			
5. Are the conclusions consistent with the design, methods used, and results obtained in the study?			



6. Is the Key take home message included?			
7. Are future implications of the findings included?			

## 2. References

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Latest articles/up to date were included			
2. Articles were cited correctly			
3. The correct citation style was used and limited to approx. 60 references			
4. All DOIs of references (where available) are listed			

## 3. Technical issues

	YES	NO	Comments
1. Key terms were correct			
2. Logical flow of text			
3. Grammatical/technical issues			

### 3d. REVIEWING AN OPINION PIECE

	YES	NO	Comments
<b>Title</b> is concise and descriptive of the topic on which an Opinion is being expressed			
<b>The abstract</b> is concise and is descriptive of the point under discussion. The pros and			

cons are given for the selection of the opinion and the conclusion reached.			
<b>The introduction</b> provides information about the topic and its relevance to Occupational Therapy			
<b>A review of the relevant literature</b> covering previous opinions on the topic is provided with arguments for and against the literature findings.			
<b>The author's opinion</b> is presented and supported by the literature and by personal experience. In addition, the author points out where previous opinions have been faulty and why they have proved to be so.			
There is a conclusion which supports the author's opinion.			

### 3e REVIEWING A COMMENTARY

Commentaries are like Opinion Pieces but differ in the way they are presented. The opinion piece MUST provide the author's opinion on the topic whereas the Commentary is exactly that, it comments on a subject. It includes the author's experience as part of the discussion but does not give the author's opinion on the relative merit or otherwise. It is purely descriptive.

	YES	NO	Comments
<b>Title</b> is concise and descriptive of the topic on which an Opinion is being expressed			
<b>The abstract</b> is concise and is descriptive of the point under discussion. The pros and cons are given for the selection of the opinion and the conclusion reached.			
<b>The introduction</b> should provide information about the topic and its relevance to Occupational Therapy			
<b>A review of the relevant literature</b> describing the subject matter being presented			
<b>The author's</b> personal experience in the field is used to help describe the subject. In addition, the author points out where previous opinions are disputed and why they have proved to be so.			
There is a <b>conclusion</b> which makes a statement about the relative merits of the subject under discussion.			

### References

1. Hames I (on behalf of COPE). COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewer COPE Council March 2013, v.1 [http://publicationethics.org/files/Peer%20review%20guidelines\\_0.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/Peer%20review%20guidelines_0.pdf)
2. Bourne, P.E., Korngreen, A. Ten simple Rules for Reviewers. LPoS Comput Biol 2, (9):e110. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.0030110, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.0020110>

**In addition, it recommended that reviewers complete the course offered by Publons Academy. This free course is very useful for reviewers wishing to improve their skill as a reviewer. The course can be found at <http://publons.com/community/academy>.**