



Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal
Policy Document
2024

Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal Policies

ABOUT	3
Background	3
The Allergy Society of South Africa	3
The Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal.....	3
JOURNAL INFORMATION	3
Aims.....	3
Scope.....	3
Criteria for publication	3
EDITORIAL TEAM.....	5
Editor.....	5
Editorial Board.....	5
PUBLISHING INFORMATION	6
Journal platform.....	6
Indexing and listing	6
ISSN info	6
Publication frequency	6
POLICIES	7
Peer review	7
Open access policy.....	8
Copyright and licensing.....	8
Ethics and Malpractice Policy.....	9
Plagiarism policy	22
Conflict of interest policy	24
Article correction and retraction policy	25
Revenue sources and advertising policy	25
Article processing charges and author fees.....	25
Digital archiving and preservation	25
Language policy.....	25
Generative AI policy	26
INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS.....	28
INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS.....	41
ARTICLE SUBMISSION	45

ABOUT

Background

Current Allergy & Clinical Immunology is the official journal of the Allergy Society of South Africa and is produced as a service for health care workers to improve understanding and communication in the field of allergy.

Allergy Society of South Africa

The Allergy Society of South Africa (ALLSA) was founded in 1988. ALLSA is the national Allergy Society of South Africa representing all related allied health professionals. The purpose of ALLSA is to advance the knowledge and practice of allergy and immunology through publications, meetings, and conferences and to foster the education of both students and the public. ALLSA is primarily a professional society for medical practitioners and other allied health care workers and scientists involved in the research, diagnosis, treatment and management of allergic diseases.

JOURNAL INFORMATION

Aims

The aim of the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* is to serve as a platform for the publication of original scientific research and the advancement of knowledge in the field of allergic diseases and clinical immunology in South Africa. While the emphasis is placed on the South African perspective and relevance to allergologists in a developing world setting, we strive to maintain an international audience. Furthermore, *ALLSA* aims to disseminate knowledge in order to keep allergologists and related healthcare providers abreast of the local and international developments in allergic diseases and clinical immunology.

Scope

Current Allergy & Clinical Immunology publishes articles concerned with the understanding and practice of allergic diseases or clinical immunology.

The journal is published four times a year and contains a wide range of medical and scientific articles, congress reviews and previews, medical news items and pharmaceutical company news.

Criteria for publication

- The article falls within the scope of the journal.
- Methods, statistics, and other analyses are performed to a high technical standard and are described in sufficient detail.
- Results reported have not been published elsewhere.
- Conclusions are presented appropriately and are supported by the data.

- The article is presented in an intelligible fashion and is written in standard English (British usage).
- The research meets all applicable ethical standards.
- The article adheres to guidelines provided in the Instructions for Authors section.

EDITORIAL TEAM

Editors

Prof E Weinberg

Dr D Hawarden

Editorial Board

Dr P de Waal

Mr A Jansen

Dr S Karabus

Prof S Kling

Prof JG Peter

Dr J van der Walt

Prof A van Niekerk

Prof C Gray

Dr S Emanuel

Prof M Jeebhay

Dr T Kerbelker

Dr A Manjra

Prof P Potter

Prof G Todd

Dr S van den Berg

PUBLISHING INFORMATION

Journal platform

Journal website: <http://www.allsa.org>

Indexing and listing

The *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* and has received DHET accreditation from the South African Department of Higher Education and Training.

All articles published in the ALLSA are indexed on:

- Scopus
- Embase
- Sabinet
- EBSCO

ISSN info

- ISSN Number: 1609-3607

Publication frequency

Quarterly

POLICIES

Peer review

Original Research Articles, Case Reports and Review Articles are subject to peer review. The peer review process involves the following:

- All manuscripts undergo an initial assessment by the Editorial Office to ensure that they comply with the Instructions to Authors and the Journal Policies.
- The Editors then screens the submission to ascertain if it complies with the Criteria for Publication (see Scope)
- Any submission by an Editorial Board member will be handled by editorial staff independent of the publication. For submissions where the Editor is an author or co-author, the submission will be handled by the Deputy Editor.
- The Editor can at this stage advise on one of the following:
 - Reject the manuscript
 - Reject and recommend major revision prior to resubmission
 - Send out the manuscript for peer-review
- Should the editor recommend 'Reject' or 'Reject and resubmit', a brief outline of the reasons for rejection should be provided to the authors.
- If a manuscript is deemed suitable for review by the Editor, a minimum of two reviewers will be appointed.
- Reviewers will be given one week to respond to the request to review.
- Reviewers are given three weeks to submit a report. At least two reports are required to make a decision.
- The review process is double blind, that is, both authors' and reviewers' identities are concealed.
- To ensure a blinded review, the main body of the manuscript should not contain any identifying information, including author's names, institutions or affiliations. Please do not include the name of the ethics committee; this information should be provided in the title page. Editorial staff may redact any information contained in the manuscript, which may compromise the blinding of the peer review process.
- Once two reports have been received, the Editor will make one of the following recommendations:
 - **Send out for additional peer-review** (In case of conflicting peer-review reports. Please provide the name and email address of potential additional peer-reviewer/s), or
 - **Reject**, or
 - **Major revisions required** (Revised manuscript needs to be sent back to the original peer-reviewers for review and final decision), or
 - **Minor revisions required** (Revised manuscript can be approved by you as the Section Editor alone), or
 - **Accept as is.**
- Reviewers are required to declare any conflict of interest, where applicable.
- Reviewed articles should be treated confidentially prior to publication.
- If reviewers' recommendations diverge, the Editor can arbitrate the recommendation or refer the manuscript to a third reviewer.

- Once the final decision has been reached, the decision letter is sent to the authors.
- Authors are given 21 days to revise a manuscript. Editors then make a decision on minor revisions and refer major revisions back to reviewers for their recommendations before making a decision.
- Correspondence regarding editorial decisions will be communicated to the authors by the editorial office.
- Authors can appeal a decision in writing to the Editorial board.

Open access policy

- The main benefit of open access publication is the high visibility of your work. All articles are made freely available online for everyone immediately upon publication.
- All articles published by the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* are made freely and permanently accessible online immediately upon publication.
- Authors of articles published in *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* are the copyright holders of their article and have granted to any third party, in advance and in perpetuity, the right to use, reproduce or disseminate the article, in accordance with our copyright and licensing policy.
- Unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium is permitted, provided the author/editor is properly attributed.

Copyright and licensing

Ownership of content (Copyright policy)

- Authors of articles published in the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* retain the copyright of their articles without any restrictions.
- Authors retain publishing rights and are free to reproduce and disseminate their work.
- Authors requiring a variation of this policy should inform the Journal during the submission of their article.

Reproduction of articles and content (Licensing policy)

- All content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License (CC BY 4.0).
- This license facilitates open access by allowing free immediate access to and unrestricted reuse of original work.
- This licencing policy is in terms of all articles or content and all versions of such content. This includes figures, tables and images.
- Under this license, authors agree to make articles legally available for reuse, without permission or fees.
- Anyone may copy, distribute or reuse these articles as long as the author and original source are properly cited.

- No permission is required from the authors or the publishers to reuse or repurpose journal content provided the original article is cited. Simply citing the original article can provide appropriate attribution.
- Example citation:
- Newman S, Ndlovu T, Botha K, et al. Updated map of the moisturiser landscape for atopic dermatitis in South Africa. *Curr. Allergy Clin Immunol J.* 2023;36(3):154-161.

Ethics and Malpractice Policy

Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal is committed to maintaining the highest level of integrity in the content published. Work submitted to *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* should be in accordance with the principles laid down by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and the Responsible research publication position statements as developed at the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity in Singapore 2010.

The relevant COPE policies and procedures can be found at: <https://publicationethics.org/>

COPE Guidelines: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Guidelines>

COPE Flowcharts: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>

Handling of possible misconduct

- Reviewers and Editors have a duty to act if they suspect misconduct.
- This duty extends to both published and unpublished papers.
- Reviewers and Editors should not simply reject papers that raise concerns about possible misconduct. They are ethically obliged to pursue alleged cases.
- If reviewers encounter any irregularities concerning research and publication ethics, they have a responsibility to inform the handling editor. For example, reviewers may have concerns that misconduct occurred during either the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript or may notice substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article.
- In the case of these or any other ethical concerns, the handling editor should be contacted directly, and the reviewers should not attempt to investigate on their own. It is appropriate for the reviewer to cooperate, in confidence, with the journal, but not to personally investigate further unless the journal asks for additional information or advice.
- Editors should first seek a response from those accused.
- If they are not satisfied with the response, they should ask the relevant employers, relevant regulatory bodies or national research integrity organization to investigate.
- For research performed in South Africa, the guidelines provided by the National Department of Health Guidelines “Ethics in Health Research: Principles, Processes

and Structures” (2nd Edition, 2019) identifies the National Health Research Ethics Council (NHREC) as the regulatory authority in terms of section 72 of the National Health Act (NHA).

- In terms of this act, NHREC must refer matters concerning violations of ethical or professional rules to the relevant health professions council (e.g., HPCSA) and recommend disciplinary action against persons found to have violated the norms and standards set for the responsible and ethical conduct of health research.
- Editors should make all reasonable efforts to ensure that a proper investigation is conducted; if this does not happen, Editors should make all reasonable attempts to persist in obtaining a resolution to the problem. This is an onerous but important duty.
- Editor should follow the COPE flowcharts where applicable. These can be accessed: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>

Editor’s responsibilities – Ethics and malpractice

Adapted from the COPE Code of Conduct for Journal Editors. The full document can be accessed at:

https://publicationethics.org/files/Code_of_conduct_for_journal_editors_Mar11.pdf]

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, all Editors (including Section Editors) have the following responsibilities:

General duties and responsibilities of Editors

Editors should be accountable for everything published in the journal, and they should:

- Strive to meet the needs of readers and authors.
- Constantly improve the journal.
- Ensure the quality of the material they publish.
- Champion freedom of expression.
- Maintain the integrity of the academic record.
- Preclude business needs from compromising intellectual standards.
- Always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

Relations with readers

- Ensure that readers are informed about who funded the research and the role of the funders in the research.

Relations with authors

- Editors should take all reasonable steps to ensure the quality of the material published, recognising that the different sections within the journals may have a different focus and standards.
- Editors' decisions to accept or reject a paper for publication should be based on the paper's importance, originality, clarity, scientific validity, and the study's relevance to the remit of the journal.
- A description of peer review processes must be published on the journal's website, and Editors should be ready to justify any deviation from the described processes.
- That the journal has a declared mechanism for authors to appeal against Editorial decisions.
- Editors should publish guidance to authors on everything that is expected of them. This guidance should be regularly updated and should refer or link to this policy.
- Editors should not reverse decisions to accept submissions unless serious problems are identified with the submission.

Relations with reviewers

- Editors should guide reviewers on everything that is expected of them, including the need to handle submitted material in confidence. This guidance should be regularly updated and should refer to or link to this code.
- Editors should require reviewers to disclose any potential competing interests before agreeing to review a submission.
- Editors should have systems in place to ensure that peer reviewers' identities are protected.

Relations with editorial board members

- Editors should provide new editorial board members with guidelines on everything expected of them and keep existing members updated on new policies and developments.

The peer-review process

- Editors should strive to ensure that peer review at the journal is fair, unbiased and timely.
- To assign appropriate reviewers, editors must match reviewers with the scope of the content in a manuscript to get the best reviews possible.
- Editors should ensure that material submitted to their journal remains confidential while under review.
- If you are the editor handling a manuscript and decide to review that manuscript yourself (perhaps if another reviewer could not return a report), do this transparently and not under the guise of an additional anonymous reviewer.

Complaints

- Editors should follow the procedure set out in the COPE flowchart.
- Editors should respond promptly to complaints and should ensure there is a way for dissatisfied complainants to take complaints further.

Encouraging debate

- Cogent criticisms of published work should be published unless Editors have convincing reasons why they cannot be.
- Authors of criticised material should be given the opportunity to respond.
- Studies that challenge previous work published in the journal should be given an especially sympathetic hearing.
- Studies reporting negative results should not be excluded.

Encouraging academic integrity

- Editors should ensure that the research material they publish conforms to internationally accepted ethical guidelines.
- Editors should endeavour to ensure that research they publish was carried out according to the relevant internationally accepted guidelines (e.g., the Declaration of Helsinki for clinical research)
- Editors should seek assurances that an appropriate body has approved all research (e.g., research ethics committee, institutional review board). However, Editors should recognise that such approval does not guarantee that the research is ethical.

Protecting individual data

- Editors should protect the confidentiality of individual information (e.g., that obtained through the doctor-patient relationship). It is, therefore, almost always necessary to obtain written informed consent from patients described in case reports and for photographs of patients. It may be possible to publish without explicit consent if the report is important to public health (or is in some other way important); consent would be unusually burdensome to obtain; a reasonable individual would be unlikely to object to publication (all three conditions must be met).

Dealing with possible misconduct

- Editors have a duty to act if they suspect misconduct. This duty extends to both published and unpublished papers.
- Editors should not simply reject papers that raise concerns about possible misconduct. They are ethically obliged to pursue alleged cases.

- Editors should first seek a response from those accused. If they are not satisfied with the response, they should ask the relevant employers or the relevant regulatory body or national research integrity organization to investigate.
- Editors should follow the COPE flowcharts where applicable. These can be accessed: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>
- Editors should make all reasonable efforts to ensure that a proper investigation is conducted; if this does not happen, Editors should make all reasonable attempts to persist in obtaining a resolution to the problem. This is an onerous but important duty.

Ensuring the integrity of the academic record

- Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.
- If, after an appropriate investigation, an item proves to be fraudulent, it should be retracted. The retraction should be clearly identifiable to readers and indexing systems.

Relations with journal owners and publishers.

- The relationship of Editors to publishers and owners is often complex but should, in each case, be based firmly on the principle of Editorial independence. Notwithstanding these economic and political realities, Editors should decide which articles to publish based on quality and suitability for readers rather than for immediate financial or political gain.

Commercial considerations

- Editors should have declared policies on advertising in relation to the content of the journal.
- Misleading advertisements must be refused, and Editors must be willing to publish criticisms according to the same criteria used for material in the rest of the journal.
- Reprints should be published as they appear in the journal unless a correction is to be added.

Intellectual property

- Editors should be alert to intellectual property issues and work with the publisher to handle potential breaches of intellectual property laws and conventions.

Conflict of interest

- Editors should have systems for managing their own conflicts of interest and those of their staff, authors, reviewers and Editorial board members.

- Journals should have a declared process for handling submissions from the editors, employees, or editorial board members to ensure unbiased review.

Reviewer responsibilities – Ethics and malpractice

Adapted from the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. The full document can be accessed here: <https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>

Professional responsibility

- Authors who have benefited from the peer review process should consider becoming peer reviewers as a part of their professional responsibilities.
- Anyone interested in becoming a reviewer should review the journal guidelines on peer review and follow the requirements posted.
- Reviewers should provide the journal with the relevant professional contact information.
- It is important to recognise that impersonation of another individual during the review process is considered serious misconduct (e.g., see COPE Case 12-12: Compromised peer review system in published papers) (<https://cope.onl/case-review-2>).
- When approached to review, agree to review only if you have the necessary expertise to assess the manuscript and can be unbiased in your assessment.
- It is better to clearly identify any gaps in your expertise when asked to review.

Competing interests and bias

- It is important to remain unbiased by considerations related to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, origins of a manuscript, or commercial considerations.
- Ensure you declare all potential competing or conflicting interests. If you are unsure about a potential competing interest that may prevent you from reviewing, do raise this. Competing interests may be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious in nature.
- If you discover a competing interest that might prevent you from providing a fair and unbiased review, notify the journal and seek advice.
- Similarly, notify the journal as soon as possible if you do not have the necessary expertise to assess a manuscript's relevant aspects to not unduly delay the review process.
- If you suspect the identity of the author(s), notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential competing or conflict of interest.
- If you are currently employed at the same institution as any of the authors or have been recent (e.g., within the past 3 years) mentors, mentees, close collaborators or joint grant holders, you should not agree to review.

- You should not agree to review a manuscript just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting a review or agree to review a very similar manuscript to one you have in preparation or under consideration at another journal.

Suspicion of ethics violations

- If you encounter any irregularities regarding research and publication ethics, do let the editor know.
- For example, you may have concerns that misconduct occurred during the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript, or you may notice substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article. In the case of these or any other ethical concerns, contact the editor directly and do not attempt to investigate on your own. It is appropriate to cooperate, in confidence, with the journal, but not to personally investigate further unless the journal asks for additional information or advice.

Timeliness

- It is courteous to respond to an invitation to peer review within a reasonable time frame, even if you cannot undertake the review.
- If you feel qualified to judge a particular manuscript, you should agree to review only if you are able to return a review within the proposed or mutually agreed time frame.
- Always inform the journal promptly if your circumstances change and you cannot fulfil your original agreement or if you require an extension.
- If you cannot review, it is helpful to suggest alternative reviewers, if relevant, based on their expertise and without any influence of personal considerations or any intention of the manuscript receiving a specific outcome (either positive or negative).

Confidentiality

- Respect the confidentiality of the peer-review process and refrain from using information obtained during the peer review process for your own or another's advantage or to disadvantage or discredit others.
- Do not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript (including early career researchers you are mentoring) without first obtaining permission from the journal. The names of any individuals who have helped with the review should be included so that they are associated with the manuscript in the journal's records and can also receive due recognition for their efforts.

Review process and report

- Read the manuscript, supplementary data files and ancillary material thoroughly (e.g., reviewer instructions, required ethics and policy statements), getting back to

the journal if anything is not clear and requesting any missing or incomplete items you need.

- Do not contact the authors directly without the permission of the journal.
- Be objective and constructive in your review, providing feedback that will help the authors to improve their manuscript. For example, be specific in your critique, and provide supporting evidence with appropriate references to substantiate general statements to help editors in their evaluation. Be professional and refrain from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libellous or derogatory personal comments or unfounded accusations.
- Bear in mind that the editor requires a fair, honest, and unbiased assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript.
- The journal allows reviewers to provide confidential comments to the editor as well as comments to be read by the authors. Ensure your comments and recommendations for the editor are consistent with your report for the authors; most feedback should be put in the report that the authors will see. Confidential comments to the editor should not be a place for denigration or false accusation, done in the knowledge that the authors will not see your comments.
- If you have not reviewed the whole manuscript, indicate which aspects of the manuscript you have assessed.
- With regards to language and style, remember it is the authors' paper, so do not attempt to rewrite it to your own preferred style if it is basically sound and clear; suggestions for changes that improve clarity are, however, important. In addition, be aware of the sensitivities surrounding language issues due to the authors writing in a language that is not their first or most proficient language, and phrase the feedback appropriately and with due respect.
- It is the job of the peer reviewer to comment on the quality and rigour of the work they receive. If the work is not clear because of missing analyses, the reviewer should comment and explain what additional analyses would clarify the work submitted.
- It is not the job of the reviewer to extend the work beyond its current scope. Be clear which (if any) suggested additional investigations are essential to support claims made in the manuscript under consideration and which will just strengthen or extend the work.

Accountability

- Prepare the report by yourself, unless you have permission from the journal to involve another person.
- Refrain from making unfair negative comments or including unjustified criticisms of any competitors' work mentioned in the manuscript.
- Refrain from suggesting that authors include citations to your (or an associate's) work merely to increase citation counts or enhance the visibility of your or your associate's work; suggestions must be based on valid academic or technological reasons.

- Do not intentionally prolong the review process, either by delaying the submission of your review or by requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or author.
- If you are the editor handling a manuscript and decide to review that manuscript yourself (perhaps if another reviewer could not return a report), do this transparently and not under the guise of an additional anonymous reviewer.

Following peer review

- If possible, try to accommodate requests from journals to review revisions or resubmissions of manuscripts you have reviewed previously.
- It is helpful to respond promptly if contacted by a journal about matters related to your review and provide the required information.
- Similarly, contact the journal if anything relevant comes to light after submitting your review that might affect your original feedback and recommendations.
- Continue to respect the confidential nature of the review process and do not reveal details of the manuscript after peer review unless you have permission from the author and the journal.

Peer review training and mentoring

- Take advantage of opportunities to enrol in mentorship or training programmes to improve your peer review skills.
- Offer to mentor early career researchers as they learn the peer review process.
- Supervisors who wish to involve their students or junior researchers in peer review must request permission from the editor and abide by the editor's decision. In cases where a student performs the review under the guidance of the supervisor, that should be noted, and the student should be acknowledged as the reviewer of record.
- It is advisable to read the reviews from the other reviewers to improve your own understanding of the topic and the reason for the editorial decision.
- "Sense about Science" has a helpful guide for peer review for early career researchers. Available at: <https://senseaboutscience.org/activities/peer-review-the-nuts-and-bolts/>

Authors' responsibilities – Ethics and malpractice

According to the position statement on responsible research publication (2nd World Conference on Research Integrity, Singapore, 2010) and following COPE guidelines, researchers and authors are expected to meet the following international standards:

[Source: Wager E & Kleinert S (2011) Responsible research publication position statements. Chapter 49 in: Mayer T & Steneck N (eds) Promoting Research Integrity in a Global Environment. Imperial College Press / World Scientific Publishing, Singapore (pp 305-7). (ISBN 978-981-4340-97-7)]

Soundness and reliability

- The research being reported should have been conducted ethically and responsibly and follow all relevant legislation. [See also the Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, www.singaporestatement.org]
- The research being reported should be sound and carefully executed.
- Researchers should use appropriate data analysis methods and display (and, if needed, seek and follow specialist advice).
- Authors should take collective responsibility for their work and the content of their publications. Researchers should check their publications carefully at all stages to ensure methods and findings are reported accurately. Authors should carefully check calculations, data presentations, typescripts/submissions and proofs.

Honesty

- Researchers should present their results honestly and without fabrication, falsification or inappropriate data manipulation. Research images (e.g., micrographs, X-rays, pictures of electrophoresis gels) should not be modified in a misleading way.
- Researchers should strive to describe their methods and to present their findings clearly and unambiguously. Researchers should follow applicable reporting guidelines. Publications should provide sufficient detail to permit experiments to be repeated by other researchers.
- Reports of research should be complete. They should not omit inconvenient, inconsistent or inexplicable findings or results that do not support the authors' or sponsors' hypothesis or interpretation.
- Research funders and sponsors should not be able to veto the publication of findings that do not favour their product or position.
- Researchers should not enter agreements that permit the research sponsor to veto or control the publication of the findings (unless there are exceptional circumstances, such as research classified by governments because of security implications).
- Authors should alert the editor promptly if they discover an error in any submitted, accepted or published work. Authors should cooperate with editors in issuing corrections or retractions when required.
- Authors should represent the work of others accurately in citations and quotations.
- Authors should not copy references from other publications if they have not read the cited work.

Balance

- New findings should be presented in the context of previous research. The work of others should be fairly represented. Scholarly reviews and syntheses of existing research should be complete, balanced, and should include findings regardless of whether they support the proposed hypothesis or interpretation. Editorials or

opinion pieces presenting a single viewpoint or argument should be clearly distinguished from scholarly reviews.

- Study limitations should be addressed in publications.

Originality

- Authors should adhere to publication requirements that submitted work is original and has not been published elsewhere in any language. Work should not be submitted concurrently to more than one publication unless the editors have agreed to co-publication. If articles are co-published, this fact should be made clear to readers.
- Applicable copyright laws and conventions should be followed. Copyright material (e.g., tables, figures or extensive quotations) should be reproduced only with appropriate permission and acknowledgement.
- Relevant previous work and publications, both by other researchers and the authors' own, should be properly acknowledged and referenced. The primary literature should be cited where possible.
- Data, text, figures or ideas originated by other researchers should be acknowledged appropriately and should not be presented as if they were the authors' own. Original wording taken directly from publications by other researchers should appear in quotation marks with the appropriate citations.
- Authors should inform editors if findings have been published previously or if multiple reports or multiple analyses of a single data set are under consideration for publication elsewhere. Authors should provide copies of related publications or work submitted to other journals.
- Multiple publications arising from a single research project should be clearly identified as such, and the primary publication should be referenced.
- Publishing the same research in more than one journal is not allowed.
- Translations and adaptations for different audiences should be clearly identified, acknowledge the original source, and respect relevant copyright conventions and permission requirements. If in doubt, authors should seek permission from the original publisher before republishing any work.

Transparency

- All sources of research funding, including direct and indirect financial support, supply of equipment or materials, and other support (such as specialist statistical or writing assistance) should be disclosed.
- Authors should disclose the role of the research funder(s) or sponsor (if any) in the research design, execution, analysis, interpretation and reporting.
- Authors should disclose relevant financial and non-financial interests and relationships that might be considered likely to affect the interpretation of their findings or which editors, reviewers, or readers might reasonably wish to know. This includes any relationship to the journal, for example, if editors publish their own research in their own journal. In addition, authors should follow journal and institutional requirements for disclosing competing interests.

Appropriate authorship and acknowledgement

- A publication serves as a record not only of what has been discovered but also of who made the discovery. Therefore, the authorship of research publications should accurately reflect individuals' contributions to the work and its reporting.
- In cases where major contributors are listed as authors while those who made less substantial or purely technical contributions to the research or to the publication are listed in the acknowledgement section, the criteria for authorship and acknowledgement should be agreed at the start of the project. Responsibility for the correct attribution of authorship lies with authors themselves working under the guidance of their institution. Research institutions should promote and uphold fair and accepted standards of authorship and acknowledgement. When required, institutions should adjudicate in authorship disputes and should ensure that due process is followed.
- Researchers should ensure that only those individuals who meet authorship criteria (i.e., made a substantial contribution to the work) are rewarded with authorship and that deserving authors are not omitted.
- In order to qualify for authorship, authors should satisfy all four the criteria for authorship as specified by the ICMJE:
 - 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.
- Other 'contributors' or 'collaborators' can be acknowledged at the end of the manuscript together with their contribution. Those whose contributions do not justify authorship may be acknowledged individually or together as a group under a single heading (e.g., "Clinical Investigators" or "Participating Investigators"), and their contributions should be specified (e.g., "served as scientific advisors," "critically reviewed the study proposal," "collected data," "provided and cared for study patients", "participated in writing or technical editing of the manuscript").
- All authors should agree to be listed and should approve the submitted and accepted versions of the publication. Any change to the author list should be approved by all authors, including any who have been removed from the list. The corresponding author should act as a point of contact between the editor and the other authors and keep co-authors informed and involve them in major decisions about the publication (e.g., responding to reviewers' comments).
- Authors should not use acknowledgements misleadingly to imply a contribution or endorsement by individuals who have not, in fact, been involved with the work or given an endorsement.

Accountability and responsibility

- All authors should have read and be familiar with the reported work and should ensure that publications follow the principles set out in these guidelines. In most cases, authors will be expected to take joint responsibility for the integrity of the research and its reporting. However, if authors take responsibility only for certain aspects of the research and its reporting, this should be specified in the publication.
- Authors should work with the editor or publisher to correct their work promptly if errors or omissions are discovered after publication.
- Authors should abide by relevant conventions, requirements and regulations to make materials, reagents, software or datasets available to other researchers who request them. Authors must also follow relevant journal standards. While proper acknowledgement is expected, researchers should not demand authorship as a condition for sharing materials.
- Authors should respond appropriately to post-publication comments and published correspondence. They should attempt to answer correspondents' questions and supply clarification or additional details where needed.

Adherence to peer review and publication conventions

- Authors should follow publishers' requirements that work is not submitted to more than one publication for consideration at the same time.
- Authors should inform the editor if they withdraw their work from review or choose not to respond to reviewer comments after receiving a conditional acceptance.
- Authors should respond to reviewers' comments in a professional and timely manner.
- Authors should respect publishers' requests for press embargos and should not generally allow their findings to be reported in the press if they have been accepted for publication (but not yet published) in a scholarly publication. Authors and their institutions should liaise and cooperate with publishers to coordinate media activity (e.g., press releases and press conferences) around publication. Press releases should accurately reflect the work and not include statements that go further than the research findings.

Responsible reporting of research involving humans or animals

- Appropriate approval, licensing or registration should be obtained before the research begins, and details should be provided in the report (e.g., Institutional Review Board, Research Ethics Committee approval, national licensing authorities for the use of animals).
- If requested by editors, authors should supply evidence that reported research received the appropriate approval and was carried out ethically (e.g., copies of approvals, licences, participant consent forms).
- Researchers should not generally publish or share identifiable individual data collected during the course of research without specific consent from the

individual (or their representative). Researchers should remember that the journal is now freely available on the internet and should therefore be mindful of the risk of causing danger or upset to unintended readers (e.g., research participants or their families who recognise themselves from case studies, descriptions, images or pedigrees).

- The appropriate statistical analyses should be determined at the start of the study, and a data analysis plan for the prespecified outcomes should be prepared and followed. Secondary or post hoc analyses should be distinguished from primary analyses and those set out in the data analysis plan.
- Researchers should publish all meaningful research results that might contribute to understanding. In particular, there is an ethical responsibility to publish the findings of all clinical trials. The publication of unsuccessful studies or experiments that reject a hypothesis may help prevent others from wasting time and resources on similar projects. If findings from small studies and those that fail to reach statistically significant results can be combined to produce more useful information (e.g., by meta-analysis), then such findings should be published.
- Authors should supply research protocols to journal editors if requested (e.g., for clinical trials) so that reviewers and editors can compare the research report to the protocol to check that it was carried out as planned and that no relevant details have been omitted. Researchers should follow relevant requirements for clinical trial registration and should include the trial registration number in all publications arising from the trial.

Plagiarism policy

Plagiarism occurs when someone presents the work of others (data, text, or theories) as if it were his/her own without proper acknowledgment. There are different degrees of plagiarism. The severity depends on the extent of copied material, originality of copied material, position/context/type of material, and referencing/attribution of the material used. Every case is different, and therefore decisions will vary per case.

Examples of possible plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- Verbatim copying of another's work and submitting it as one's own.
- Verbatim copying of significant portions of text from a single source.
- Mixing verbatim copied material from multiple sources ('patchwork copying'). This could range from one or two paragraphs to significant portions consisting of several paragraphs.
- Changing key words and phrases but retaining the essential content of the source as a framework.
- Rephrasing the text's original wording and/or structure and submitting it as one's own.
- Mixing slightly rephrased material from multiple sources and presenting what has been published already as new.
- The work is cited, but the cited portions are not clearly identified. This can be combined with copied parts of the text without citation.

Note: For review papers, the above is not directly applicable. Review papers are expected to give a summary of existing literature. Authors should use their own words except for correctly quoted and/or cited texts, and the work should include a new interpretation.

As part of the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal's* commitment to protecting and enhancing the peer review process, all manuscripts deemed potentially suitable for publication will undergo a plagiarism detection process using plagiarism detection software. When a similarity report is indicative of a potential offence, the report and manuscript will be examined by the Editors to determine whether or not the material has been plagiarised and, if so, the extent of the plagiarism.

If plagiarism is suspected, the COPE guidelines on plagiarism will be followed. [<http://publicationethics.org/files/Suspected%20plagiarism%20in%20a%20submitted%20manuscript%20%281%29.pdf>]

Duplicate submission/publication refers to the practice of submitting the same study to two journals or publishing more or less the same study in two journals. These submissions/publications can be nearly simultaneous or years later. Redundant publication (also described as 'salami publishing') refers to the situation that one study is split into several parts and submitted to two or more journals, or the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission or justification. 'Self-plagiarism' is considered a form of redundant publication. It concerns recycling or borrowing content from previous work without citation. This practice is widespread and might be unintentional. Transparency by the author on the use of previously published work usually provides the necessary information to assess whether it is deliberate or unintentional.

If redundant or duplicate publication is suspected, the COPE guidelines on redundant or duplicate publication will be followed.

[http://publicationethics.org/files/redundant%20publication%20A_0.pdf]

Conflict of interest policy

A conflicting interest exists when professional judgment concerning a primary interest (such as a patient's welfare or the validity of research) may be influenced by a secondary interest (such as financial gain or personal rivalry). It represents a situation in which financial or other personal considerations from authors, reviewers or editors have the potential to compromise or bias professional judgment and objectivity. It may arise for the authors when they have a financial interest that may influence their interpretation of their results or those of others. Examples of potential conflicts of interest include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, grants, or other funding.

A conflict of interest declaration must be submitted on the title page of each submission and should list each author separately by name, e.g., 'John Smith declares that he has no conflict of interest. Paula Taylor has received research grants from Drug Company A. Mike Schultz has received a speaker honorarium from Drug Company B and owns stock in Drug Company C.' If multiple authors declare no conflict, this can be done in one sentence.

Reviewers and/or Section Editors may also have a conflict of interest or a competing interest concerning the subject matter of a manuscript. Such conflicts are disclosed to the handling editor and/or the Editor as early in the review process as possible. If warranted, a different reviewer will be reassigned to evaluate the manuscript. All *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology* editors have disclosed any conflicts of interest to the Editor, who has resolved those as necessary to ensure that an editor conflict of interest does not impact the review of any manuscript submission. The Editor has no known conflicts of interest or competing interests and makes the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of all manuscripts submitted.

Sources of funding must be acknowledged and disclosed at the end of the manuscript text. Authors should declare any involvement of study sponsors in the study design; collection, analysis and interpretation of data; the writing of the manuscript; the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. If the study sponsors had no such involvement, this should be stated.

If any conflict of interest should arise, action shall be taken as recommended by COPE.

Article correction and retraction policy

All authors are obliged to provide retractions, clarifications or corrections of mistakes in case of detection. To submit a retraction or correction, please contact the Journal Manager (robyn@jesser-point.co.za).

Under exceptional circumstances involving plagiarism, redundant publication, data errors and/or flawed conclusions, published articles may need to be retracted, removed or replaced to protect the integrity of the journal. The need for a retraction will be determined by the Editor but may be initiated at the request of the author/s.

To request retraction of an article, contact the Editor stating title and authors of the article, the reason for the retraction and who is retracting the article. Notice of retraction will be published in the next issue and linked to the online version of the article.

Revenue sources and advertising policy

Advertising is the sole source of revenue for the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal*.

All advertisements are subject to approval by the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal*, which reserves the right to reject or cancel any ad at any time. Publication of advertisements in the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* does not imply endorsement by either the Allergy Society of South Africa or the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal*. Content is not edited or modified in any way to accommodate advertisers. Editorial decisions are made without influence by advertisers or sponsors.

In consideration of the publication of an advertisement, the advertiser and the agency, jointly and severally, agree to indemnify and hold harmless the publisher, the Allergy Society of South Africa and the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal*, its officers, agents and employees against expenses (including legal fees) and losses resulting from the publication of the contents of the advertisement, including, without limitation, claims or suits for libel, violation of privacy, copyright infringement or plagiarism. All advertisements are accepted and published on the warranty of the agency and advertiser that both are authorised to publish the entire contents and subject matter of the advertisement.

Article processing charges and author fees

There are no charges for the publication of articles in the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal*.

Digital archiving and preservation

To ensure ongoing accessibility and long-term preservation, the following measures have been implemented:

- Journal website: <https://allsa.org/>

All digital journal content is stored on a secure server which is backed up frequently. In the event of a problem, the backup will be restored within 24 hours.

- Self-archiving:

Authors may archive the final published version of their articles in personal or institutional repositories immediately after publication.

Language policy

Manuscripts must be written in English (British usage).

Generative AI policy

This policy has been developed to provide clarity and direction for authors, readers, reviewers, and editors engaging with generative AI and AI-assisted technologies within the context of the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal*. This policy intends to establish a transparent framework for the appropriate use of such technologies. It is important to note that this policy solely pertains to the writing process and does not include AI tools for data analysis and research insights.

While embracing these advancements, the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* remains committed to monitoring and adapting this policy as necessary. Authors employing AI and AI-assisted technologies during the writing process must limit their application to improving the document's readability and language. They should refrain from substituting crucial authoring responsibilities, including developing scientific, educational, or medical insights, drawing definitive scientific conclusions, or providing clinical recommendations. The integration of these technologies should be overseen by human judgment and control. Thorough review and editing are imperative since AI-generated outputs can potentially harbour inaccuracies, omissions, or biases. It is important to emphasize that authors bear the ultimate responsibility and liability for the content of their work.

Authors are required to openly declare the utilisation of AI and AI-assisted technologies in their manuscripts. A statement highlighting this usage will be included in the published work. This declaration fosters transparency and confidence among authors, readers, reviewers, editors, and contributors.

Authors should not attribute AI and AI-assisted technologies as authors or co-authors. Authorship involves duties and tasks that are exclusive to human beings, as outlined in the Guidelines for Authorship policy. Each author assumes responsibility for addressing queries about the accuracy or integrity of any aspect of the work, and authorship mandates the capacity to endorse the final version of the work and approve its submission. Authors also shoulder the responsibility of ensuring the work's originality, verifying the eligibility of stated authors for authorship, and confirming the absence of third-party infringements.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

Authors submitting articles for consideration for publication by the journal are required to familiarise themselves with the journal Ethics and Malpractice policy prior to submission. The policy is available on the journal website: <https://allsa.org>

Criteria for publication

- The article falls within the scope of the journal.
- Methods, statistics, and other analyses are performed to a high technical standard and are described in sufficient detail.
- Results reported have not been published elsewhere.
- Conclusions are presented appropriately and are supported by the data.
- The article is presented in an intelligible fashion and is written in standard English (British usage).
- The research meets all applicable ethical standards.
- The article adheres to guidelines provided in the instructions for author's section.

Guidelines for authorship

- Each author should participate and is responsible for the content and design of the study, the preparation of the manuscript and its revisions, and final approval.
- In order to qualify for authorship, authors should satisfy all four the criteria for authorship as specified by the ICMJE:
 1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
 2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
 3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
 4. 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.
- Other 'contributors' or 'collaborators' can be acknowledged at the end of the manuscript together with their contribution. Those whose contributions do not justify authorship may be acknowledged individually or together as a group under a single heading (e.g., "Clinical Investigators" or "Participating Investigators"), and their contributions should be specified (e.g., "served as scientific advisors," "critically reviewed the study proposal," "collected data," "provided and cared for study patients", "participated in writing or technical editing of the manuscript").
- The *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal* accepts a maximum of 8 authors per article. If there are more than eight authors, the first eight authors must be listed along with the group name at the end. The remaining authors and their affiliations must then be listed in an appendix.
- On submission of your article, the ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) identifier of at least the corresponding author will be required. ORCID provides a

persistent digital identifier that distinguishes you from every other researcher and supports automated linkages between you and your professional activities, ensuring that your work is recognised. To register and find more information, please visit: <https://orcid.org>

Registration of clinical trials

- A clinical trial is defined as any research study that prospectively assigns human participants or groups of humans to one or more health-related interventions to evaluate the effects of health outcomes. Interventions include drugs, surgical procedures, devices, behavioural treatments, dietary interventions, and process-of-care changes.
- Clinical trials should be registered in a public trial registry in accordance with [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors](#) recommendations.
- Trials must be registered and approved by the relevant authorities before the onset of patient enrolment.
- The South African Health Products Regulatory Authority (SAHPRA) reference number and the SA National Clinical Trial Register (SANCTR) registration number should be included at the end of the abstract of the article.
- Purely observational studies (those in which the assignment of the medical intervention is not at the discretion of the investigator) do not require registration.

Reporting guidelines

- All articles should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines relevant to the study design, as described in the Equator Network Guidelines (<https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/>)
- Randomised trials should be accompanied by a flow diagram that illustrates the progress of patients through the trial, including recruitment, enrolment, randomisation, withdrawal and completion, and a detailed description of the randomisation procedure.

Reporting of statistics

In terms of the statistical reporting, the Equator Network advises on the use of the SAMPL guideline: <https://www.equator-network.org/2013/02/11/sampl-guidelines-for-statistical-reporting/>

The SAMPL guidelines provide two guiding principles

1. *“Describe statistical methods with enough detail to enable a knowledgeable reader with access to the original data to verify the reported results.”* When possible, quantify findings and present them with appropriate indicators of measurement error or uncertainty (such as confidence intervals). Avoid relying solely on

statistical hypothesis testing, such as P values, which fail to convey important information about effect size

2. “Provide enough detail that the results can be incorporated into other analyses.” This requires reporting the descriptive statistics from which other statistics are derived, such as the numerators and denominators of percentages, especially in risk, odds, and hazards ratios. Likewise, P values are not sufficient for re-analysis. Needed instead are descriptive statistics for the variables being compared, including sample size of the groups involved, the estimate (or “effect size”) associated with the P -value, and a measure of precision for the estimate, usually a 95% confidence interval.

Some specific guidelines applicable to the *Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal*:

- Consistency is one of the most important factors in presenting a well-formatted, professional manuscript.
- The nature of the measurements and variables reported on will often dictate the amount of precision required. Report numbers—especially measurements—with an appropriate degree of precision. For ease of comprehension and simplicity, round to a reasonable extent.
- The recommendation is to report the number of decimals that have both clinical and statistical meaning and consistently reporting all other variables in the same manner.
- Note: Generally, for descriptive purposes, percentages are reported as whole numbers except when dealing with really large sample sizes
- At least for the primary outcomes, report a measure of precision (a confidence interval).
- Although not preferred to confidence intervals, if desired, p values should be reported as equalities to three decimal places (e.g., $p = 0.031$ and not as inequalities: e.g., $p < 0.05$). Do NOT report “NS”; give the actual P -value. The smallest P -value that needs to be reported is $p < 0.001$.
- Report numerators and denominators for all percentages.
- Summarise data that are approximately normally distributed with means and standard deviations (SD). Use the format: mean (SD), not mean \pm SD.
- Summarise data that are not normally distributed with medians and interpercentile ranges, ranges, or both.
- Do NOT use the standard error of the mean (SE) to indicate the variability of a data set. Use standard deviations, inter-percentile ranges, or ranges instead.

Formatting examples:

- $p = 0.028$ or $p < 0.001$
- (43% vs 21%; $p = 0.002$)

- (odds ratio (OR) 0.38; 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.71 to 1.82; $p = 0.822$) or after first use (OR 1.62; 95% CI 1.41 to 1.86; $p < 0.001$)
- *Descriptive stats normal distribution*: mean age 36 years (SD 4 years) or 36 years (SD 4; range 40 to 97 years)
- *Descriptive stats non-normal distribution*: median age 36 years (IQR 44 to 88 years) or 36 years (IQR 44 to 88 years; range 40 to 97 years)
- *Descriptive stats percentage*: (149 of 202; 74%)

Formatting of submissions

Text formatting

- Use Times New Roman, 12-font size.
- Use 1½ line spacing throughout the document.
- Number the pages of the blinded manuscript consecutively.
- Use italics for emphasis.
- When referring to an article with multiple authors, please use the following format: Rabinowitz et al. published their retrospective review.
- Do not use field functions.
- Use tab stops or other commands for indents, not the space bar.
- Use the table function, not spreadsheets, to make tables.
- Use the equation editor or MathType for equations.
- Save your file in docx format (Word 2007 or higher) or doc format (older Word versions).

Headings

- Use no more than three levels of displayed headings.

Abbreviations

- Define abbreviations and acronyms at first mention and use consistently thereafter.

Units

- Follow internationally accepted rules and conventions: use the international system of units (SI). If other units are mentioned, please give their equivalent in SI.

Figures

- Figures should be numbered consecutively with illustration Arabic numbers 1, 2, 3, etc.

- The figure should be listed in the text as follows: ... skin discolouration and... (*Figure 1*).
- Figures should be clear and easily understandable with a full descriptive legend stating any areas of interest and explaining any markings, letterings or notations. All figures should be understandable without the main text.
- For radiographs, please ensure you state the view used and the time point at which it was taken, as well as the demographic details of the patient if applicable.
- Figures should not be imbedded in the text file but should be submitted as separate individual files. Each figure should be a separate file, entitled Figure 1, Figure 2, etc.
- Remove all markings, such as patient identification, from radiographs before photographing.
- All line or original drawings must be done by a professional medical illustrator.
- We accept a maximum of six figures.
- Do not submit any figures, photos, tables, or other works that have been previously copyrighted or contain proprietary data unless you have obtained and can supply written permission from the copyright holder to use that content.

Tables

- Tables should carry uppercase Roman numerals, I, II, III, etc.
- Tables should always be cited in the text in consecutive numerical order.
- The table should be identified in the text as follows: Details of results are listed in *Table I*. Or, alternatively, ... wheezing often associated with... (*Table II*).
- Tables should be used to present information in a clear and concise manner. All tables should be understandable without the main text.
- For each table, please supply a table heading explaining the components of the table.
- Identify any previously published material by giving the original source in the form of a reference at the end of the table heading.
- Footnotes to tables should be indicated by superscript lower-case letters and included beneath the table body.
- Please submit tables as editable text and not as images. They should be created using the Table tool in Word.
- We accept a maximum of eight tables.
- Do not duplicate information given already in the text.
- Do not submit any figures, photos, tables or other works that have been previously copyrighted or contain proprietary data unless you have obtained and can supply written permission from the copyright holder to use that content.

References

- References should be numbered consecutively in the order that they are first mentioned in the text and listed at the end in numerical order of appearance.
- Identify references in the text by Arabic numerals in superscript after punctuation.

- References should not be a listing of a computerised literature search but should have been read by the authors and have pertinence to the manuscript.
- Accuracy of references is the author's responsibility, and the author is to verify the references against the original documents.
- Manuscripts in preparation, unpublished data (including articles submitted but not in the press) and personal communications may not be included in the reference listing. They may be listed in the text in parentheses only if absolutely necessary to the contents and meaning of the article.
- The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in Index Medicus, obtainable through the website <http://www.nlm.nih.gov>
- The following format should be used for references:

Journal article:

Sidhu GS, Ghag A, Prokuski V, Vaccaro AR, Radcliff KE. Civilian gunshot injuries of the spinal cord: a systematic review of the current literature. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2013;471:3945-55.

Ideally, the names of all authors should be provided, but the usage of 'et al.' in long author lists (more than six authors) will also be accepted: Fong K, Truong V, Foote CJ, et al. Predictors of non-union and reoperation in patients with fractures of the tibia: an observational study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2013;14:103.

Online journal article:

Caetano-Lopes J, Lopes A, Rodrigues A, et al. Upregulation of inflammatory genes and downregulation of sclerostin gene expression are key elements in the early phase. *PLoS One* 2011;6:e16947.

Web reference (with authors):

Ciorny G, DiPasquale D. Adult osteomyelitis protocol. http://www.osteomyelitis.com/pdf/treatment_protocol.pdf.

(date last accessed 05 March 2013).

Web reference (no authors listed):

No authors listed. International commission on radiological protection. <http://www.icrp.org> (date last accessed 20 September 2009).

Chapter in a book:

Young W. Neurophysiology of spinal cord injury. In: Errico TJ, Bauer RD, Waugh T (eds). *Spinal Trauma*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: JB Lippincott; 1991: 377-94.

Dissertation:

Borkowski MM. Infant sleep and feeding: a telephone survey of Hispanic Americans [dissertation]. Mount Pleasant (MI): Central Michigan University; 2002.

Abstract:

Peterson L. Osteochondritis of the knee treated with autologous chondrocyte transplantation [abstract]. ISAKOS Congress, 2001.

Structure and content of submission

- We accept a maximum of 3 500 words, including the abstract and body of the text (excluding references).
- Exceptions to this rule may be made for systematic reviews and meta-analysis at the discretion of the Editor.
- Please follow the following structure when preparing your submission. Each of the following should be submitted as a separate file.
 - Title page (title, authors and affiliations, corresponding author and declarations)
 - Blinded manuscript (Abstract, keywords, introduction, methods, results, discussion, funding sources, conflict of interest statement, ethics statement, acknowledgements and references)

Title page

Title

- The title should be concise and informative.

Author names and affiliations

- Please provide the following information for each author:
 - Full names and surname, as well as title
 - Qualifications
 - Designation
 - Affiliation and address
 - ORCID ID (see Article Submission section)
- Please check that all names are accurately spelled.
- Indicate all affiliations with a lower-case superscript letter immediately after the author's name and in front of the appropriate affiliation details.
- Provide the full postal address of each affiliation, including the country name and, if available, the e-mail address of each author.

Corresponding author

- Clearly indicate who will handle correspondence at all stages of refereeing and publication, including post-publication.
- Ensure that the e-mail address and permanent address is given and that contact details are kept up to date by the corresponding author.
- Please note that the corresponding author's contact details will be provided in the final article.
- Provide the following information for the corresponding author:
 - Full names and title
 - Affiliation
 - Physical address
 - Postal address
 - Telephone number
 - E-mail address

Declarations

Authors are to insert a section at the end of the title page entitled declarations (please provide the author's name, signature and date). The following statements are required under the declarations section:

a. Authorship

The authors confirm that all authors have made substantial contributions to all of the following:

- The conception and design of the study, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data.
- The drafting of the article or its critical revision for important intellectual content.
- Final approval of the version to be submitted.

b. Sound scientific research practice

The authors further confirm that:

- The manuscript, including related data, figures and tables, has not been previously published and is not under consideration elsewhere.
- No data have been fabricated or manipulated (including images) to support conclusions.
- This submission does not represent part of a single study that has been split up into several parts to increase the quantity of submissions and submitted to various journals or to one journal over time (e.g., 'salami-publishing').

c. Plagiarism

The authors confirm that the work submitted is original and does not transgress the plagiarism policy of the journal.

- No data, text or theories by others are presented as if they were the authors' own.

- Proper acknowledgements of others' work have been given (this includes material that is closely copied, summarised and/or paraphrased); quotation marks are used for verbatim copying of material.
- Permissions have been secured for copyrighted material.

d. Conflict of interest statement

A conflicting interest exists when professional judgment concerning a primary interest (such as the patient's welfare or the validity of research) may be influenced by a secondary interest (such as financial gain or personal rivalry). It represents a situation in which financial or other personal considerations from authors, reviewers or editors have the potential to compromise or bias professional judgment and objectivity. It may arise for the authors when they have a financial interest that may influence their interpretation of their results or those of others. Examples of potential conflicts of interest include employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, paid expert testimony, patent applications/registrations, grants, or other funding. All potential conflicts of interest need to be declared. The conflict-of-interest statement should list each author separately by name, e.g.,

'Author A.B. (use initials of relevant author, not full name in order for the document to remain blinded) has received research grants from Company A. Author B.C. has received a speaker honorarium from Company X and owns stock in Company Y. Author C.D. is a member of committee Z.'

If no conflicts of interest exist, state this as follows:

'The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest that are directly or indirectly related to the research.'

e. Funding sources

All sources of funding should be declared. Also, define the involvement of study sponsors in the study design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data; the writing of the manuscript; and the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

List all funding sources as follows:

'This work was supported by the xxxx (grant numbers xxxx, yyyy).'

When funding is from a block grant or other resources available to a university, college or other research institution, submit the name of the institute or organisation that provided the funding.

If no funding was received, state as follows:

'No funding was received for this study.'

f. Compliance with ethical guidelines

- For all publications:

'The author/s declare that this submission is in accordance with the principles laid down by the Responsible Research Publication Position Statements as developed at the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity in Singapore, 2010.'

Available from: <http://publicationethics.org/resources/international-standards-for-editors-and-authors>

Institutional Review Board (IRB) ethical approval must have been given if the study involves human subjects or animals. Please provide the approval number. IRB documentation should be available upon request.

'Prior to the commencement of the study, ethical approval was obtained from the following ethical review board: *Provide name and reference number*'

- For studies with human subjects include the following:

'All procedures were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional and national) and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.'

'Informed written consent was or was not obtained from all patients for being included in the study.'

- For studies with animals, include the following sentence:

'All institutional and national guidelines for the care and use of laboratory animals were followed.'

- For articles that do not contain studies with human or animal subjects:

'This article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects.'

If doubt exists whether the research was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration, the authors must explain the rationale for their approach and demonstrate that the institutional review body explicitly approved the doubtful aspects of the study. If any identifying information about patients is included in the article, the following sentence should also be included: Additional informed consent was obtained from all patients for which identifying information is included in this article. The Helsinki Declaration 2008 can be found at <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/>

g. Generative AI

The following instructions are specific to the writing process and do not pertain to the use of AI tools for data analysis and research insights.

When utilizing generative artificial intelligence (AI) and AI-assisted technologies in your academic writing, it should be solely for enhancing readability and language. Ensure that all AI application undergoes human oversight and control. Review and edit the generated content, as AI may produce text that could be inaccurate, incomplete, or biased. Authors bear the ultimate responsibility and accountability for the contents of their work.

Avoid attributing AI and AI-assisted technologies as authors or co-authors or quoting them as such, as authorship should only apply to humans directly involved in the research process.

Authors must disclose the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process by incorporating a declaration statement under the title: 'Declaration of the use of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies in the Writing Process.'

Statement: During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used [NAME TOOL / SERVICE] to [REASON]. After employing this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as necessary, assuming full responsibility for the content of the publication.

If your work does not involve the use of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies, please include the following statement:

Statement: No Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies were used during the preparation of this work.

Please note: These declarations do not apply to the use of basic tools for grammar checking, spelling, referencing, etc. Such routine tools do not need to be mentioned in the disclosure statement.

Manuscript preparation:

Articles should be submitted by email to robyn@jesser-point.co.za. Authors should state their full name, qualifications, institutional affiliation and provide a corresponding address and email on the title page. ORCID are optional. The type of article should also be specified:

Research/Review and Ethics (Law) articles

These articles should be a maximum of 3500 words with no more than 3 figures and 3 tables. An abstract of no more than 200 words must be included. For research articles the following headings should be used: Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusion(s). Five keywords should be provided for all articles.

CPD questions (*not* required for research articles and case reports):

- Please compose 4 multiple-choice (single-best answer) questions related to your article for our CPD questionnaire and submit these as a separate *MSWord document* with your article.
- The questions should be straightforward and educational, not obscure or trick questions. They are simply to test whether the reader has read and understood the article.
- Each question must contain a minimum of 4 options with only one correct answer.
- Please provide the answers to the questions.
- No true and false questions.
- No commercial product promotion and satire should be included.

Case reports

Case reports should not exceed 2000 words, with a maximum of 3 figures, 3 tables and 10 references and must have a summary of not more than 50 words. Five keywords should be provided. Prior permission must be obtained from the patient. In the case of minors (children younger than 18 years of age), permission from a parent or legal guardian, should be obtained.

Case reports should be submitted, together with a Patient Consent Form to Dr Pieter de Waal at doctorforkids@outlook.com.

A photograph (instead of a scanned email document) of the completed **consent form** may also be sent to Dr de Waal at: **084 8903 234**, with the original copy kept in the patient's clinical records.

Telephonic consent is also acceptable – this should be clearly indicated on the **Patient Consent Form**. We welcome illustrative images pertaining to the case, but patient consent should be obtained prior to submission (see **Patient Consent Form**). These usually add clinical and illustrative value to reports (see (6) below). The reviewers of Case Reports may edit images, to protect a patient's identity or to prevent images of sensitive nature from being published.

Declarations

The following declarations must be stated at the end of the manuscript before the references:

- Declaration of conflict of interest: Authors should disclose any relationship within the last 2 years with pharmaceutical companies in the following categories, if pertinent to the article: research grants, educational support (sponsorship at conferences), advisory boards, consultant, or shares in companies. If there is no conflict of interest, please state “The author declares no conflict of interest.”
- Funding
- Plagiarism: The authors acknowledge that the Editorial Board reserves the right to use plagiarism detection software on any submitted material.
- Ethics approval **must** be included with all original research articles.
- All abbreviations must be spelt out when first used in the text and thereafter used
- Tables must be numbered with Roman numerals, thus: I, II, III, and illustrations/figures with Arabic numerals, thus 1, 2, 3, etc.
- Images must be submitted separately from the manuscript file as high-resolution jpg or png files, and clearly labelled. *Images should NOT be submitted in Powerpoint format or be included in the MSWord.* The source of the images must be provided.
- Manuscripts submitted in the incorrect format will be returned for revision before consideration for publication.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Reviewers are requested to familiarise themselves with the journal Ethics and Malpractice policy prior to commencing the review. The policy is available on the journal website: <https://allsa.org>

Introduction

- Comprehensive, high-quality, blinded peer review is essential to maintain an adequate publication standard.
- Peer reviewers are allergologists or physicians from other disciplines who possess special expertise and who have demonstrated their willingness to perform timely and thorough manuscript reviews for the journal. Guest reviewers are invited if unique experience or knowledge is required on a specific topic.
- Reviewers are asked to follow the structure and guidelines described below.
- A methodological review is conducted for papers that have received a favourable content review and are being considered for publication.
- Please also see our peer review policy.

General guidelines

- When you receive the invitation to review, please consider the following question:
- Do you have time to complete the review before the deadline?
- Are you familiar enough with the content area and/or methods to provide a high-quality review?
- Do you have any potential conflicts of interest?
- If you are unable to review for any of these reasons, please reply promptly to the invitation e-mail to allow another reviewer to be appointed.
- Please attempt to complete your review within the provided deadline. If you are not able to complete your review in time, please contact the Editorial Office.
- A well-organised, detailed, thoughtful review will often be passed on to the authors.
- Make your review as objective and evidence-based as possible. Perform a literature search on the topic to familiarise yourself with the current literature on the subject (OVID, Google Scholar and PubMed, at least).
- Your review can be as critical as you judge necessary. Always provide constructive criticism. Your comments should be helpful to the author(s) and should never be demeaning or pejorative. The authors are likely to have put a considerable amount of time and energy into their work. Disparaging comments are not helpful.
- Do not spend a lot of time correcting language, grammar or spelling. If errors in these areas interfere with the overall message, make a general comment to this effect. If a specific error confuses a point, make a specific comment.
- Please keep the content of the manuscript confidential.
- Please avoid including a signature or any other ways of identifying you as a reviewer.
- If you have any concerns, please contact the Section Editor directly.

- Follow a systematic procedure to review the manuscript and to write your review (see below).

Structure of review

The outline below serves as a general recommendation. Peer-reviewers are, however, welcome to adapt it as deemed necessary or alternatively utilise their own template.

- Recommendations following review
 - Reject (resubmission not recommended)
 - Reject and resubmit
 - Major revision required
 - Accepted with minor revision
 - Accepted as is
- Summary
 - Summarise the article in a short paragraph. The aim is to demonstrate your understanding of what the work is about.
 - Briefly state your understanding of the research question and methodology.
- General comments
 - Provide a paragraph for this to put the study in the context of previously reported information.
 - Is it relevant to clinical practice in South Africa?
 - Is the relevance to the South African orthopaedic surgeon discussed?
- Specific comments with regard to the relevant individual components of the manuscript (more comprehensive guidelines are provided below)
 - Title
 - Abstract
 - Level of evidence
 - Introduction:
 - Methods
 - Results
 - Discussion
 - Conclusion
 - References
 - Illustrations
 - Tables
 - Organisation
 - Language, punctuation, grammar and spelling
- Please also consider adding the following additional elements to the review as you see fit:
 - A. Comments to Section Editor or Editor-in-Chief
These comments will be held in confidentiality and not shared with the authors of the article.
 - B. Additional criteria that may need to be considered prior to accepting an article:

1. Was the research question clearly elucidated in the introductory section?
2. Was sufficient detail provided in the Methods section so that another researcher can replicate the study?
3. Was the statistical methodology employed sound?
4. Were subject recruitment procedures and inclusion and exclusion criteria accurately described?
5. Was the follow-up period adequate?
6. Were the limitations of the study adequately explored?
7. Was the conclusion supported by the data presented in the study?
8. Were all necessary references provided?
9. Was the necessary ethical standard maintained?
10. Does the article satisfy the requirements set out in the Instructions for authors section?

Specific comments

This part of the review consists of a description of your specific concerns with the manuscript. Ideally, refer to a specific location in the text (including the page, paragraph and/or line numbers). Your specific, precise comments will be valuable to the authors when they revise their work. Constructive criticism will be appreciated.

- Title
 - Does it clearly describe the subject of the paper?
- Abstract
 - Is it an accurate, succinct reflection of the aims, methods, results and conclusion?
- Introduction
 - Is it an unbiased introduction to the topic?
 - Is an adequate background given?
 - Does it mention the relevance of the research question?
 - Do the authors give a research question or hypothesis?
 - Are the aims and objectives communicated clearly?
- Methods
 - Was the methodology employed appropriate for the research question that was posed?
 - Could the study be replicated with the details given?
 - Was the sampling described?
 - Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria adequate?

- Is the statistical analysis sufficiently and correctly described, and is it appropriate?
- Results
 - Do the results address the research questions?
 - Are there unnecessary duplications (i.e. results in the text also shown in tables?)
 - Are the results described logically and in a clear fashion?
- Discussion
 - Is a logical and meaningful interpretation of the results made?
 - Is the interpretation of the results within the boundaries of the study limitations?
 - Are the results brought into context with current knowledge and evidence?
 - Has it been done in a balanced manner?
 - Did the authors describe the implications of the findings?
 - Is there a statement made regarding the generalisability of the findings?
 - Are limitations given adequately?
- Conclusion
 - Is there a clear and logical summary of the findings?
 - Is the conclusion scientifically valid in terms of the results that were presented?
 - Do the authors give suggestions for future research?
 - Is a take-home message given?
- References
 - Is the bibliography adequate, and was all relevant literature discussed (without being excessive)?
 - Have all the important statements been referenced?
- Illustrations
 - Do illustrations support the main point of the article?
 - Are all the illustrations appropriate and necessary? If not, which ones would you delete?
 - Are the legends adequate?
- Tables
 - Are all the tables necessary, or could several tables be combined?
 - Are clarifications or additional columns needed?

- Please suggest changes if you believe that they would help the author to present the information more clearly.
- Organisation
 - Is the organisation of the manuscript satisfactory?
 - Does the text provide the reader with all the information that is needed in each section?
- Language, punctuation, grammar and spelling
 - Is this of an acceptable standard?

Decision categories

- ***Reject and resubmission not recommended***

This means that the paper is considered inadequate for publication in the journal, either because the quality is too poor, or because the paper is out of scope for the journal, or because of ethical problems (duplicate submission, self-plagiarism or plagiarism). List two or three major reasons why you believe the manuscript should be rejected. If you are recommending a rejection of the manuscript, it is neither necessary nor desirable to complete a comprehensive specific comments section as these are intended to help the authors who are invited to revise their submission.

- ***Reject and resubmit***

This is relevant in the following situations:

- The submission is incomplete, or
- The submission fails to comply with the Instructions for authors guidelines, or
- The submission fails to comply with Equator Network Guidelines for health research reporting, or
- The submission is not consistent with the expected appearance, language, grammar, presentation or overall quality, AND
- The content of the paper could potentially be of interest, but the paper has too many deficits to expect that it will be of sufficient quality to allow publication following a normal major revision. Compared to a simple 'reject' decision, this is a signal to the authors that they may have an interesting idea but need to write a new paper and not enhance the existing one.

- ***Major revision***

This implies that the paper is below standard for publication in its present state and requires substantial revision. Reasons may include lack of putting the work into perspective, lack of sufficient experimental validation, serious flaws in the way the work is presented or justified, etc. However, the reviewer believes that the authors can correct these deficiencies. A major revision decision is in

no way a commitment to ultimately accept a revised version of the paper for publication. If the revised version of a paper has not addressed the initial concerns and still raises major concerns after major revision, it is probably better to reject it than to extend the reviewing process.

- ***Minor revision***

This means that the major aspects of the paper are considered to be of sufficient quality for publication. This is a commitment to ultimately publish the paper, provided that the authors adequately answer the remaining concerns (which should be relatively minor) and correct the relevant language/grammar/spelling problems.

- ***Accepted as is***

The article is suitable for publication as is, without further revision or corrections. This decision is not typically used following the first review but is frequently applied to papers after minor/major revision.

ARTICLE SUBMISSION

Submission declaration and verification

With the submission of an article, the authors confirm that:

- The work described has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis or as an electronic preprint). Please see our ethics policy for more information.
- That it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.
- The content of the article is the sole work of the author(s), and that the article has been prepared with cognisance of our plagiarism policy.
- That its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in any other language.

Prior to submission

- Please familiarise yourself with the policies of the ***Current Allergy and Clinical Immunology Journal***.
- Please read Instructions to Authors prior to submission. It will also be beneficial to familiarise yourself with the Instructions for Reviewers section.
- It is the authors' responsibility, and not the reviewers, to ensure that the language, grammar, or spelling is acceptable for publication.
- Cross-check all references to ensure that the bibliography is accurate.

Submission procedure

- Articles can be emailed to the Journal Manager (Robyn Marais) at: robyn@jesser-point.co.za