



Daleen Casteleijn

**Review of articles for SAJOT: A
practical workshop for clinicians,
academics and reviewers**

UNIVERSITY OF THE
WITWATERSRAND,
JOHANNESBURG



15 July 2016

Agenda for the day

- Background about SAJOT
- Categories of submission
- Who review articles
- What's in it for me?
- Format of review for SAJOT
- Content of the review process
- Writing the report
- How to do a thorough review



Background about SAJOT

- Started in 1970? – now in vol 46
- Went electronic only since 2016 – OTASA website (members only)
- OTASA's publication
- Current status: online, on EBSCO database
- 3 issues per year
- Peer reviewed
- Different types of articles: categories of submissions
- Impact factor



Categories of submission

- Scientific article – research articles, 2500 – 5000 words
- Scientific letters – 1500 – 1700 words
- Literature reviews – critical review of literature, systematic review, meta-analysis
- Opinion pieces – encourage debate and exchange ideas, new policies, weird practices
- Commentaries – informed comment
- Biographies – life stories with the focus on occupations
- Book reviews – new books of interest

Terminology:

Manuscript when it is the review process,

article when it is published



Who review articles

- Peers
- Knowledge about the topic
- Experience according to category of submission
- You and me!



What's in it for me?

- CPD points
- Learning about research techniques
- CV listing
- Massive contribution to status of SAJOT – your expertise in the specific field
- Contribution on an international level for OT



- Receive an e-mail from Marj Concha inviting you to review a submission to SAJOT
- Log onto the SAJOT website: www.sajot.co.za



South African Journal of Occupational Therapy

HOME ABOUT LOGIN SEARCH CURRENT ARCHIVES OTASA GUIDE TO SUBMITTING AN ARTICLE REVIEWERS' GUIDE REGISTER [OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS](#)

Home > **Vol 44, No 3 (2014)**

South African Journal of Occupational Therapy

The South African Journal of Occupational Therapy (SAJOT) is the official Journal of the Occupational therapy Association of South Africa and is a leading publication for research into occupational therapy in Africa. SAJOT publishes and disseminates research articles that contribute to the scientific knowledge of the profession and its outcomes with particular reference to service delivery in Africa. It provides a platform for debate about issues relevant to OT in Africa which will also contribute to the development of the profession worldwide.

Authors wishing to publish in SAJOT should access the information about publishing in SAJOT by clicking on the **ABOUT** section of the Journal, scrolling to the submissions subsection and reading the Author Guidelines.

The team managing the articles consists of the following members:

Marjorie Concha - Editor

Dain Van der Reyden - Assistant Editor

Neeltje Smit - Assistant Editor

The articles published in the following editions of SAJOT can be found in pdf format by clicking on the Archives section and clicking on the relevant journal volume:

Vol 40, No 3, 2010; Vol 41, Nos 1 - 3, 2011; Vol 42, No 1 and No 2, 2012.

Please note : members of OTASA can log on to OTASA site (see link above) and access the full text of the articles published in Vol 41 Nos 1-3 2012 as well as the most recent journal ie Vol 43 No1 2013. Log on using you OTASA user name and password.

Vol 44, No 3 (2014): The South African Journal of Occupational Therapy

Table of Contents

Journal Help

USER

Username

Password

Remember me

NOTIFICATIONS

- [View](#)
- [Subscribe](#)

JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

Search Scope

Browse

- [By Issue](#)
- [By Author](#)
- [By Title](#)

FONT SIZE

INFORMATION

- [For Readers](#)
- [For Authors](#)
- [For Librarians](#)



[REGISTER](#)

[Journal Help](#)

[Home](#) > [User](#) > [Reviewer](#) > **Active Submissions**

USER

You are logged in as...

dcasteleijn

- [My Profile](#)
- [Log Out](#)

Active Submissions

REVIEWER

Submissions

- [Active](#) (0)
- [Archive](#) (4)

[ACTIVE](#) [ARCHIVE](#)

ID	MM-DD ASSIGNED	SEC	TITLE	DUE	REVIEW ROUND
<i>No Submissions</i>					

NOTIFICATIONS

- [View](#)
- [Manage](#)

ISSN 0038-2337 (print), ISSN 2310-3833 (online)

JOURNAL CONTENT

Search

Search Scope

All ▾

Browse

- [By Issue](#)
- [By Author](#)
- [By Title](#)

FONT SIZE

Review Steps

1. Notify the submission's editor as to whether you will undertake the review.

Response Accepted

2. If you are going to do the review, consult Reviewer Guidelines below.

3. Click on file names to download and review (on screen or by printing) the files associated with this submission.

Submission Manuscript [294-1298-1-RV.DOCX](#) 2014-09-25

Supplementary File(s) None

4. Click on icon to fill in the review form.

Review Form 

5. In addition, you can upload files for the editor and/or author to consult.

Uploaded files [294-1332-1-RV.DOCX](#) 2014-10-19

[294-1332-2-RV.DOCX](#) 2014-10-19

6. Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Recommendation **Decline Submission** 2014-10-19

Please evaluate the article according to each of the following standards/criteria and allocate a mark related to the following scale on the line next to each criterion.

Please motivate the rating and give a recommendation underneath.

SCALE:

0 = non compliance – needs extensive revision

1 = partial compliance – needs to be reviewed

2 = compliance

N/A = not applicable

1. TITLE

The title is concise and descriptive of the research problem/focus.

1 (partial compliance - needs to be reviewed) ▼

(Please comment)

forward to read the article. Unfortunately the information in the article does not live up to the expectations. There are too few examples and discussion to the article.

2. SUMMARY or ABSTRACT

The abstract is a true reflection of the content of the article and reflects the full research process.

1 (partial compliance - needs to be reviewed) ▼

(Please comment)

Abstract is a true reflection but article is too brief to be published.

3. THE INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND/RATIONALE

The introduction/background introduces the research problem clearly and motivates the significance of the research

0 (non compliance 0 needs extensive revision) ▼

(Please comment)

The introduction needs elaboration. The need for this article/study is not clear. I see little references to the original need to search for evidence in OT in Mental Health for these

4. PROBLEM STATEMENT, RESEARCH QUESTION, PURPOSE and OBJECTIVES

The problem statement is specific, clear, logical and coherent in relation to the introduction. The research question, purpose and objectives should be clearly stated.



Content of the review

1. Title

- The title is concise and descriptive of the research problem/focus.

2. Summary or abstract

- The abstract is a true reflection of the content of the article
- reflects the full research process.

3. The introduction/background/rationale

- The abstract is a true reflection of the content of the article
- reflects the full research process.

4. Problem statement, research question, purpose and objectives

- The problem statement is specific, clear, logical and coherent in relation to the introduction.
- The research question, purpose and objectives should be clearly stated.



Content of the review

5. Conceptualisation/literature review

- Key concepts are clearly defined.
- The literature review supports the findings and adds meaning to the research problem

6. Research design and methods

- The research design is clearly described
- appropriate to research purpose/problem,
- The data collection/measuring instrument is clearly described,
- The data collection methods are appropriate and justified,
- The methods of data analyses are clearly described and are appropriate,
- The methods for determining validity and reliability are clearly described,
- The population is described according to size and characteristics and the sampling methods are given,
- Ethical considerations are given



Content of the review

7. Results / findings, conclusions and recommendations

- The results / findings are clearly described and interpreted,
- related to the research purpose,
- the line of reasoning is evident
- the limitations of the research are given
- Will often see a heading “Discussion” – line of reasoning should be clear and linked to the results

8. Technical aspects

- Referencing is according to requirements (don't leave this for the editor, reviewer needs to check this)
- grammar is correct,
- the layout and presentations are logical,
- tables/diagrams/figures are clear and accurate and supplement the text

9. Has the material been published before?

Confidentiality

- Blind review
- Small community of publishing OTs
- Recognising the authors
- Integrity and professionalism needed



Track changes

- Download the full manuscript/article to read
- Use track changes to indicate suggested changes
- Change identifying information in track changes – confidentiality issue
- Need to upload this document onto the SAJOT website when submitting your review



Writing the report

- “Report” already generated online
- Comments under each aspect in the review form to be formulated carefully
- Comment on positive aspects as well.
- Be critical – SAJOT is a global publication
- Track changes in the article to be in line with your comments
- Check for spelling and grammar in your comments



How to do a thorough review

- Read the abstract – are you confident with this topic
- Check the category of submission – are you confident with the category
- Are you biased towards the topic?
- Accept promptly
- Do the review within the time frame – set aside time in your schedule

Aspect	How critical
Read the aims and objectives of the manuscript – write it somewhere	Medium
Start reading the manuscript from the beginning to the end – does it link well with aims and objectives	Low
Is the background information leading up to the problem logical?	Medium
Read the literature review – check the references carefully. Read some of the references.	Medium
Methodology – correct method for the aims and objectives	High

How to do a thorough review

Aspect	How critical
Is the methodology clear so that it can be repeated	High
Part of methodology: design, sample, data collection tools, data collection procedure, data analysis	High
Ethical considerations and ethical clearance number	High
Results	High
Start with demographics of the sample	Medium
Do the results address the aims – are the aims “answered”	High
Discussion – so what, compared to previous research, bringing something new or different perspective to the table, in line with results	High
Limitations of the study	Medium
Recommendations – in line with results	Medium

How to do a thorough review

Aspect	How critical
Acknowledgements	Low
References – according to SAJOT style, current, leading literature	High
Tables – not too many, heading for each table that is descriptive, stand alone, numbering in roman letters (I, II, III, IV etc) and above the table	Medium
Figures – not too many, heading, stand alone, arabic numbers 1, 2, 3 etc	Medium
Length of the manuscript – see requirements	Medium
The message of the work – is it clear, one or two main messages. If too many, not a good article	Medium
Contribution to OT	High
Why in the SAJOT? Our journal is not a dumping journal	High+++

Guide to reviewing an article for SAJOT

Guidelines for peer review provided by the Committee on Publications Ethics (COPE)¹ and in the Ten Simple Rules for Reviewers published by Bourne and Korngreen².

- **Respect the confidentiality**
- **Do not use information obtained during the peer-review process**
- **Declare all potential conflicting interests**
- **Time frame to complete the review – do not accept if you are unable to stick to deadline**
- **Write Reviews You Would Be Satisfied with as an Author**
- **Be objective and constructive in the review**

1. Hames I (on behalf of COPE). COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. COPE Council March 2013, v.1 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.



Practical exercise

- Sections of manuscripts to be reviewed by participants:
 - Abstract
 - Introduction
 - Literature review
 - Methodology
 - Results
 - Discussion
 - References



Common problems

- Key message and implications for practice not clear
- Not clear or not focused
- Objectives not well formulated or discussed
- Integration of literature into discussion
- Other?



Discussion

When to reject a manuscript?



Conclusion

- Professional responsibility
 - OT professional standing
 - quality of articles to be part of systematic reviews
 - quality for other purposes e.g. review of standing of OTs in NRF review
- International show case
- SAJOT the most NB tool for professional standing

