

Editorial

THE TWO IMPORTANT FACTORS IN A PEER REVIEW JOURNAL

The quality of publications in this journal is underpinned by the contributions of authors and reviewers. In other words the substance of manuscripts submitted needs to be of a high standard in order to contribute to the body of knowledge. It is important that authors produce text that has no or very few grammatical errors, especially in the use of verbs. A well written manuscript makes the task of a reviewer easy compared to one that is poorly written.

Good reviewers result in high quality publications. A reviewer is basically providing a criticism of a manuscript. This could be subjective if there are no guidelines. Original research submitted to the *SAR* is blind reviewed by two reviewers. They could have totally different comments. In view of this they are provided with online guidelines to reduce widely different opinions. Reviewers of original research comment on the following: suspicion of plagiarism; relevance of the manuscript in terms of adding to the body of literature; methods, results and conclusion; sample size; analysis and discussion of data in terms of existing body of knowledge (literature); and whether the described methodology addresses the aim and objectives of the study. Reviewers have to consider whether readers would be able to use the described methodology to produce similar results in future studies. For a case report reviewers consider its relevance within the context of current literature. For an opinion paper they consider whether the discussion is balanced.

The editor is responsible for the final content in this journal. This includes ensuring that all submitted manuscripts meet publication ethics. For example, use of patients' records/images requires their consent in terms of the relevant legislation. Manuscripts that have two or more authors must clearly show that each author did play a significant role in the research, for example.

Authors should access the web for the format for each type of submission: original research, opinion paper, articles of interest, and case report. If in doubt they can email the editor or access similar papers in the archives on the web to ensure that they are on the right track. All authors are required to sign the conditions of submission form, which was recently revised and now includes in-house layout and formatting: authors to use italics without inverted commas for verbatim responses/comments of participants in qualitative research; the comments/responses in italics to be indented within the manuscript.

In this issue the articles cover original research, case reports, and articles of interest. Each adds to the body of knowledge. The authors and reviewers are thanked for their valuable contributions to the *SAR*.

Leonie Munro
EDITOR

Peer Review Process

Original articles are first reviewed by an editorial advisory group who have the right to recommend rejection or referral for review.

SARad obtains:

- i) Two reviews on ALL MATERIAL except case reports.
- ii) One review on case reports from an expert in the subject.

Reviewers consider the material in terms of whether it contains new information, if there is proof thereof, if applicable were the statistical methods used appropriate, and what should be done to improve the manuscript in terms of grammar, and clarity of meaning. In addition they comment on relevance of tables, figures in terms of illustrating key points. Reviewers advise the editor whether to accept reviewed material for publication. *SARad uses a grading system for peer reviewers:* Reviewed material should be returned to the editor within 21 (twenty-one) days. Persons who are experts in their fields and who have published material are invited to review material on a voluntary basis.

Interested persons are welcome to volunteer to review material.

South African Radiographer articles accessed online (open access) at <https://sar.org.za>