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 journal does not publish protocols of studies.

The language of the Journal is 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
https://journals.assaf.org.za/index.php/sajot/, www.scielo.org.za. EBSCOHost, ProQuest, Google Scholar or OTDBASE. 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 Diamond Open Access Journals, no post-acceptance publication fees are charged.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSIONS

The following are included in these instructions:

1. General guidelines and instructions – procedure and presentation
   1.1 AI/LMM Declaration
   1.2 Plagiarism Check report / certificate
   1.3 Referencing
   1.4 General Requirements
2. Summary of Guidelines for authors
   2.1 Guidelines for authors of research articles (quantitative and qualitative)
   2.2 Additional Guidelines for authors of qualitative research
   2.2 Guidelines for authors of scientific letters
   2.3 Guidelines for publishing a review: literature -, scoping -, systematic -, rapid -, integrative -, narrative -, rapid -, and meta-analysis review
   2.4 Guidelines for writing an opinion piece
   2.5 Guide to writing a commentary
   2.6 Instructions for book reviews
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.

1. GENERAL GUIDELINES & INSTRUCTIONS (APPLICABLE TO ALL SUBMISSIONS)

- Manuscripts must be submitted via the SAJOT web site.The author must retain a copy of the script.
- New/unregistered authors must submit the title page of the submission to the Editor in-Chief, at sajot@otasa.org.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 below).
  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@otasa.org.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.
- The main manuscript must contain all illustrations, tables, graphs or photographs. Supplementary files need to be loaded with the submission of research articles, scientific letters, reviews, commentaries, and opinion pieces. The following 3 supplementary files are required:
  - A title page with affiliations of authors at the time of the study as well as a section on the contribution of each listed author (refer to "Authorship criteria" under Policies), a declaration of any conflicts of interest, funding and data availability.
  - Plagiarism Check report / certificate

The Manuscript

- 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.
- Please include the ethics clearance number and from whom it was obtained (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 - affiliation - status as undergrad student or postgrad student at time of research - complete address - telephone number -mail address *ORCID number - HPCSA number - OTASA membership number if applicable
Ethical clearance number	• Institution where obtained
Acknowledgments	
Sources of funding	
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 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 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 author's name before submitting and that ORCID profiles are complete and up to date. It is also a requirement that the ORCID profiles of ALL listed authors are complete.

Contribution of the authors, including funding

Contribution of the author in the manuscript/research process needs to be described.
To claim authorship, each author must meet ALL 4 the criteria listed in the PUBLICATIONS AND MALPRACTICE POLICY document available on the website.

Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
- Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
- Final approval of the version to be published; AND
- Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved

Each author's contribution should be considered based on the CRediT criteria indicated in the table below

Conceptualisation	
Methodology	
Software	
Validation	

Data analysis	
Data collection	
Data Curation	
Writing-Original Draft	
Writing - Review and Editing	
Supervision	
Funding acquisition	

In cases where contributing authors do not meet all 4 the criteria, they should be listed under 'Acknowledgements' in the main manuscript.

Conflict of interests

Conflict of interests in terms of sponsorship and funding need to be declared. Any funding received must be stated

Data availability

The availability of data for 10 years post-publication should be indicated - either from the corresponding author, link or a database.

1.1 AI/LMM Declaration

The SAJOT acknowledges the benefits and opportunities of AI and large language models (LLMs) tools. As authors remain fully responsible for the originality, validity and integrity of their content, AI-generated content will not be considered for publication. Any submission found to include the use of non- permitted AI generated content will be either declined or retracted if already published in accordance with the SAJOT's Policy on Publication Ethics. An AI check will be run on all new submissions during desk editing.

AI Declaration
A declaration disclosing the use of AI/LMM in the submission must be included. This may indicate:
the use of AI to edit descriptive images, revise and edit script, and seek and summarise existing literature. AI used for these purposes must be declared at the time of submission in a cover letter and detailed in the Methods or Acknowledgements section. This declaration should include the name, version and manufacturer of the tool used, and the date that it was accessed. For example:
"Chat GPT 3.5 Version 28 August 2023, Open AI, accessed 25 October, 2024" The "prompt" or instruction entered in the tool should also be provided, either in the Methods section or as a supplementary file to the manuscript.

No declaration is required for the use of AI specifically for spelling and grammar checks, similarity checking and reference management.

1.2 Plagiarism Check report / certificate

Authors must submit a 'Cross Ref' or 'Turn-it-in' or 'Authenticate' certificate. An acceptable level usually 15% or less, depending on the use of terminology in the manuscript, must be maintained.

1.3   **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. Please check references from predatory journals are avoided. Predatory journals can be checked at https://predatoryjournals.com/journals/ or https://beallslist.net/.

ALL references must be linked through CrossRef, i.e., each reference must show its DOI number (if it has one). To find the DOI number go to https://search.crossref.org/. A window that askes to 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 <u>one line</u> and is not split between two lines. See examples of referencing below:

See what styles to use in Mendeley and Endnote to format references and examples of referencing in Appendix A.

1.4   **General Requirements**

	Abstract (words)	Pages	Tables and figures	Words (without tables and references)	References
Research 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
Reviews	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.

Use no more than three levels of headings as follows

● 1st level headings are BOLD AND IN UPPERCASE
● 2nd level headings are Bold, lowercase
● 3rd level headings are not bold but Lowercase and in italics

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. All quotes from

literature must be in quotation marks " ". Quotes from participants in qualitative research should be in quotation marks and in italics.

Tables must be editable and should have the heading in Arial 11 font at the top of the table and labelled with Roman letters e.g., Table II.

Figures must be editable and should be labelled at the bottom of the figure in Arial 11 font 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 lightish, 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 websites may be helpful for authors to consult either during the research process or during the write up process:

- 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.
- Typeset (https://www.typeset.io/), an online research communication platform that autoformats documents and helps ensure they are 100% compliant with journal submission guidelines.
- 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.
- Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations (https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/fulltext/2014/09000/standards_for_rep orting_qualitative_research__a.21.aspx)

POST-SUBMISSION PROCESS:

 Desk Edit Stage:

All submissions will undergo a desk-edit by an editorial team member. During this process, the assigned editor will check the following:

- whether all general requirements as outlined in the Table above have been met;
- the overall contribution of the article to the profession and whether it falls within the scope and aim of SAJOT;
- whether all supplementary files have been submitted in the required format;
- whether all listed authors meet the authorship criteria
- the general 'readability' of the manuscript, format, referencing etc.

Based on the above, the assigned editor will decide whether:

- the article can be accepted and sent for review
- some minor revisions are required before sending the manuscript for review,
- the article needs to be re-submitted anew for consideration (soft decline)
- to decline the article

Review Stage

Once accepted for review, two suitable reviewers are assigned to review the manuscript. All manuscripts undergo two anonymous double blind peer reviews. The reviewers are required to comment on the knowledge claim, scientific worth and clinical relevance 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 (based on the recommendations of the reviewers) for further action required. Recommendations could be:
- to accept the article without revision;
- to request some revisions to be made;
- to subject the article to a second round of reviews;
- to decline the article.

Copy-Editing Stage

Once the final, revised version of the manuscript has been uploaded, it will be sent to the Copy-editing phase of the workflow. During this stage, two editors will edit the article and prepare it for conversion to PDF. The authors will then be requested to perform a final proofread of the copy-edited manuscript and when required, the final PDF version thereof. After approval from the authors, the submission will be scheduled for publication.

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.
The SAJOT retains copyright of the published work.
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) For further information, see
https://journals.assaf.org.za/index.php/sajot/policies

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 before 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.

- 15 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@otasa.org.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 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 during the copy edit process.
- With Microsoft Office documents, author identification should also be removed from the properties of the file.

See how to remove your Identity from track changes and comments on documents in Appendix B

2. GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

2.1 GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS OF RESEARCH ARTICLES

(for Additional Guidelines for authors of QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, click here)

Articles submitted to the SAJOT must be original and must not have been published elsewhere. Articles should contain new information, have a unique knowledge claim that 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" which highlights focusing s on quality rather than quantity of publications" by Fenseca M. Editage Insights. Nov 4; 2013.https://www.editage.com/insights/the-pitfalls-of-salami-slicing-focus-on-quality-andnot-quantity-of-publications

FORMAT:

Abstract, Implications for Practice and Keywords

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 should be used in the abstract (introduction, methodology, results, conclusion). There should be no references or abbreviations in the abstract.

The implications for Practice should be clearly and concisely stated using bullet points under a separate heading. This should not be a repetition points mentioned in the Conclusion section of the manuscript.

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 research aims or questions. The introduction should present a clear indication of the need for and purpose of 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.

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

Methods

The section on research methods should include (when appropriate):
- the research design used,
- the population and criteria for 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

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. All figures, tables, and images will be published under a Creative Commons CC-BY license, and permission must be obtained for use of copyrighted material from other sources (including published/adapted/ modified/partial figures and images from the internet). It is the responsibility of the authors to acquire the licenses, follow any citation instructions requested by third-party rights holders, and cover any supplementary charges.

For additional information, please see the 'Image manipulation' section at policies and publication ethics

ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH:

Introduction

Please find below a summary of guidelines for the write up qualitative research projects, drawn from the following valuable readings:

1. Anderson, C. (2010). Presenting and evaluating qualitative research. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 74 (8) Article 141. https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:5bea3070-6690-30b7bd68-e72c29d1e824
2. O'Brien, Bridget C. PhD; Harris, Ilene B. PhD; Beckman, Thomas J. MD; Reed, Darcy A. MD, MPH; Cook, David A. MD, MHPE. Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations. Academic Medicine 89(9): p 1245-1251, September 2014. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388

3. Sandelowski M. (1998). Writing a good read: strategies for re-presenting qualitative data. Res Nurs Health, 21(4):375-82. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1098240x(199808)21:4<375::aid-nur9>3.0.co;2-c.
4. Setati, M. 'Re'-presenting qualitative data from multilingual mathematics classrooms. Zentralblatt für Didaktik der Mathematik 35, 294–300 (2003). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02656693

Introduction and literature review

A good introduction…

- provides a snapshot of the focus of the manuscript
- provides a focused background information to the research, including relevant literature related to the focus of the paper
- clearly states and justifies the research question in relation to the existing knowledge base
- Reflection of the influence of the researcher(s) on the data, including a consideration of how the researcher(s) may have introduced bias is included.

Methods

A comprehensive and detailed methods section…

- clearly states and justifies the qualitative research design used describing a clear link between the research question and the research design
- describes in detail the data collection methods and justifies the selection of these methods in relation to the research design selected. For example, motivate your selection of interviews or focus groups or both. Examples of the data collection tools can be referred and/or included as appendices where relevant.
- describes the study population and study setting
- explains and justifies the selection criteria for inclusion of the study participants*
- describes how participants were recruited and by whom
- includes a brief explanation of those who were invited to participate but chose not to
- describes the process by which ethical clearance and/or research permissions from sites was obtained
- describes how ethical considerations were applied during the study, for example:
  - how informed consent was gained ○ how anonymity and confidentiality were ensured ○ measures to prevent harm to participants
  - measures to support participants who become distressed as a result of engagement the data collection process (where applicable)
- describes the data collection process (duration and schedule), the methods of recording data (e.g., audio or video recording) and the procedures for transcribing data. The decision to stop data collection should be described and justified
- describes in detail the processes by which accurate translation of informed consent and data collection tools took place
- details how data sources** were managed i.e., organised, and stored securely
- describes and justifies how the data were analysed. Was computer-aided qualitative data analysis software such as NVivo (QSR International, Cambridge, MA) used? How the researcher/s arrived at ''data saturation'' or the end of data collection should be described and justified

- describes how criteria of trustworthiness (credibility, confirmability, transferability, and dependability) were applied in the study. Suggested readings: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1320570

*Qualitative research necessitates having a small sample because of the detailed and in-depth nature of these studies. Sample sizes are not calculated using statistics. Instead, qualitative researchers should describe their sample in terms of characteristics and relevance to the wider population. Purposive sampling is common in qualitative research. Particular individuals are chosen with characteristics relevant to the study who are thought will be most informative. Purposive sampling also may be used to produce maximum variation within a sample. Participants being chosen based for example, on year of study, gender, place of work, etc. to improve representativeness. Convenience samples involve the researcher choosing those who are either most accessible or most willing to take part. This may be fine for exploratory studies; however, this form of sampling may be biased and unrepresentative of the population in question. Theoretical sampling uses insights gained from previous research to inform sample selection for a new study.

**Data sources in qualitative research

- Data generated for qualitative studies can include the following:
- Audio recordings and transcripts from in-depth or semi-structured interviews
- Structured interview questionnaires containing substantial open comments including a substantial number of responses to open comment items.
- Audio recordings and transcripts from focus group sessions.
- Field notes (notes taken by the researcher while in the setting/s where studies are taking place)
- Video recordings
- Images
- Documents (reports, meeting minutes, e-mails)
- Diaries, video diaries
- Observation notes
- Press and other media clippings
- Photographs

Findings

General

In qualitative research, it is prudent to include a summary table of all participants with relevant demographic information presented. For example, if you are conducting a study exploring student experiences of studying occupational therapy it will be important to reflect aspects such as their year of study, gender, race, educational history as well as other aspects that have been shown to shape learning experiences. In this way, when the reader looks at a quote from a participant, they can review back to this summary to gain insight into from whose perspective the information was provided. This assists the reader to connect with and interpret the comments/quotes shared. In order to increase the validity of your results, it could add value to your findings/results if the data are quantified, e.g. "11 out of the 15 participants felt that.." and then supporting this finding with one or two direct quotes from 2 of the 11 participants.

Example

Table 1. Participant information

Participant name	Age	Gender	Year of study	Prior learning

| Sam*** | 19 | Not disclosed | Second | Grade 12 |

*** Pseudonym used

The researcher should select quotes that are most representative of the research findings. Including large portions of data in a research paper is not necessary. It is also important to provide all relevant information to contextualise each quote. When presenting quotes provide at least three participant details (identifiers) to link the quote to the participant presented in the summary table. See example below.

Example

The student described using deep learning, drawing on learning from a previous module:

''I found that while using the e-learning programme on ergonomics I was able to apply the knowledge and skills that I had gained in last year's human biology and anatomy courses.'' **(Sam, 19, second year student)**

Discussion

The discussion section…

- Discusses the findings within the existing literature presented in your literature review
- Discussed the strengths and limitations of the research
- Describe future directions for research

Conclusion

The conclusion…

- should be a brief and to the point conclusion of the main points of the paper and not a repetition of the discussion
- should present the take home message and emphasize what the study adds to policy and practice

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 AUTHORS OF A REVIEW

Literature -, scoping -, systematic -, rapid (see Appendix C), integrative -, narrative -, and meta-analysis reviews submitted to 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). 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, Implications for Practice). 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 whereas a scoping review would examine emerging evidence and a systematic review would identify and synthesise existing evidence.

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 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. All figures, tables, and images will be published under a Creative Commons CC-BY license, and permission must be obtained for use of copyrighted material from other sources (including re-published/adapted/modified/partial figures and images from the internet). It is the responsibility

of the authors to acquire the licenses, follow any citation instructions requested by third-party rights holders, and cover any supplementary charges.

For additional information, please see the 'Image manipulation' section of policies and publication ethics (click here).

2.3 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/10rules-for-writing-opinion-pieces.
- Astone. Ten tips to write an opinion piece people read. Climate system science. Australian Government, 2010 ttps://www.climatescience.org.au/content/1053-tentips-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.

2.4   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 Occupational therapy 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 i.e., 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. <u>Int J Qual Stud Health Well-being</u>. 2016; 11:10. <u>https://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v11.31390</u>

2.5   INSTRUCTIONS FOR BOOK REVIEWS

A book review (700 words) published in SAJOT should be focused on the relevance of the book's content to occupational therapy, withing the South African and African context but also beyond this. It should contain the following information:

- The full title of the book
- A book cover illustration
- Information on the author(s) / editor(s) ○ Qualifications, positions they hold.
    - ○ Their connection with occupational therapy

- Information on the book.
    - ○ Publication date
    - ○ Name of publisher and city of publication
    - ○ ISBN number
    - ○ Price in Rand (ZAR) and formats it is available in; paperback, hardcopy, eversion
    - ○ Number of pages

- The Review ○ Give the context and aim of the book. This is usually in the form of a brief summary of the book.
    - ○ The way in which the content is structured.
    - ○ Discus the most important aspects of the book. Either in chapter format or themes or as it appears to you. Include short quotes to illustrate, if/ as relevant to the review.
    - ○ Brief discussion on its relevance to occupational therapy, within the African context, and in general.
    - ○ If relevant mention similar books or books along the same theme line. ○ Conclude the review with a professional opinion of the book. The positive and negative aspects thereof.

- Information on the Reviewer
    - ○ Title, name, qualifications, affiliation, and work position at the time of review. ○ Contact details: email
    - ○ Declaration of bias towards the author(s) or any relevant parties mentioned in the book.

3.   GUIDE TO SUBMITTING AN ARTICLE ONLINE

Prepare the article as described above.

The following are the steps to follow:

Go to https://journals.assaf.org.za/index.php/sajot/ . 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 I – Starting the submission:

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

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 <u>Checking the</u> <u>manuscript before</u> <u>submission</u>. 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.
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 supplementary files must be uploaded: a title page, or plagiarism report. 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 may need to be done via a completely new submission depending on the extent of the revisions required.

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 upload the revised manuscript onto the website (under the original submission) with any other revised supplementary file clearly marked as 'revised version' 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 and uploaded to the website within 4 weeks. Make sure any comments and track changes are unidentified if submitted for a second round of reviews (Appendix B)

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 Editor-in-Chief at sajot@otasa.org.za

APPENDIX A : STYLES TO USE WHEN REFERENCING AND EXAMPLES OF REFERENCING

 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/ or https://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: https://doi.org/10.17159/23103833/2018/vol48n2a4
Journal names must be written out in full and capitalised but not italicised. Please not 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, Delport 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://dx.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-whitepaper-6

APPENDIX B: REMOVING IDENTITY FROM COMMENTS AND TRACK CHANGES ON DOCUMENTS

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.

APPENDIX C: GUIDELINES FOR RAPID REVIEW

A rapid review is a time-efficient synthesis of the literature which streamlines traditional review processes used to improve the time taken for uptake of research evidence into clinical decision making.

Rapid reviews will be considered for publication if

- The purpose of the review has a limited number of questions, interventions or outcomes which are clearly defined and related to occupational therapy. This may be based on engagement with end users.
- Were produced as an accelerated evidence synthesis or review in the title, abstract or main body of the document.
- Contain elements of a comprehensive, systematic or quasi- systematic literature search – may search other reviews only.
- Search strategy is described
- Have limited language of publication and limited number of years in which publication occurred (± one year)
- Methodological rigour by transparent reporting, decisions and rationale for all limits used in the rapid review should be reported
- Present results in full, and not a summary of full-text document
- Appeared to evaluate occupational therapy or system/policy questions for occupational therapy services.
- Applies a narrative descriptive synthesis of findings tailored for use within specific contexts to ensure that research evidence can be effectively and efficiently implemented into clinical practice or policy development/ implementation.