

# JOEH Manuscript Descriptions, by Category

The descriptions, below, provide guidance for selecting the appropriate manuscript type for the article to be submitted to the *JOEH*. Once selected, refer to the [JOEH Style Guide](#) for specifics on formatting and content.

## Technical Manuscript

The *Technical Manuscript* is the most common type published in the *JOEH*. This scientific article should present a study -- basic, translational, or clinical -- in which a hypothesis or aim is presented and tested. This manuscript must report a scientific investigation and provide the following, in detail:

- Introduction describing the relevance of this study, with an assessment of current gaps in knowledge on the issue;
- Clearly stated objective/hypothesis for the investigation;
- Thorough description of the methods, to the extent that someone so inclined could replicate the study;
- Clear description of the data analysis performed and results obtained; and
- Synthesis of the data with both limitations, as appropriate, and conclusions that are supported by the evidence generated.

The *Technical Manuscript* is limited to 5000 words and should have sufficient references from the scientific literature to support statements and current state of knowledge for the subject area being presented. This manuscript is reviewed by the editor for relevance, clarity, and completeness before being submitted for peer review.

## Short Report

Many studies that are technical in nature but have limited generalizability. If a study had limited participants, sample size, or was in fact a pilot study or a case report of a single event, the results from such a study might be important to contribute to the field, but might not be fully generalizable to a broader population. As such, authors should submit such their manuscript as a *Short Report*. This manuscript must provide the same information as the “technical manuscript” but should clearly explain its limitations. Studies that are exploratory in nature should also be submitted as a *Short Report*. Due to the limited scope of these studies, the authors should acknowledge that the findings might apply only to the limited sites/conditions included in the study. Thus, the *Short Reports* should identify what additional conditions that may exist in other operations that were *not* included in this case study.

The *Short Report* is limited to 3000 words, also with sufficient references from the scientific literature. This manuscript is reviewed by the editor for relevance, clarity, and completeness before being submitted for peer review.

# JOEH Manuscript Descriptions, by Category

## Review Article

*Review Articles* provide a critical review of the current state of knowledge on a topic of relevance to occupational and environmental hygiene. It is typical that reviews do not provide any new data from the authors. When preparing a *Review Article*, authors must identify a clear objective for this manuscript. This article needs to have a clear objective that has a sufficiently broad relevance to the field. A clear motivation for the review is needed in the introduction, and this should be written to appeal to both experts and practitioners who read the *JOEH*. A review might be merely to be a repository of information, with the objective to organize and evaluate the literature that exists on a current topic. A more impactful review article will attempt to synthesize the literature, identify patterns and trends, or identify knowledge gaps. To be successful, the full set of literature available on the topic should be considered.

The review article has similar structure to the research manuscript (abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion). The introduction should establish the objective and need for the review. The methods are generally short, but it should detail how the literature/evidence was selected (search engines and terms), how the evidence was evaluated, criteria for inclusion/exclusion, and, if data were extracted for a meta-analysis, how this was conducted. If the review manuscript includes a quantitative systematic review that combines data across several studies (*i.e.*, a meta-analysis), authors should address standard protocols, such as QUOROM, to follow recommended reporting for reviews.

The *Review Article* is generally 6000 words. This manuscript is reviewed by the editor for relevance, scope and objective, with attention to clarity, before being submitted to reviews by peers. Review articles are fully peer-reviewed.

## Commentary (2500 words, up to 4 pages print)

The purpose of a commentary may differ between journals. However, within the *JOEH*, the commentary a short, narrowly focused article to provide an evidence-based editorial on a topic that is relevant to the research and practice of occupational and environmental hygiene. Authors might be solicited to provide a commentary, or authors may contact the editor to propose one for the *JOEH*. These typically follow a useful format that begins with a concise summary of the past, an explanation of where we are today, and what we need to do to close gaps in knowledge or technology today, so that we can protect workers. Ending such a commentary so that readers are asked, as individuals or as a profession, to take a specific action, can be highly effective and useful to the *JOEH* readers.

## JOEH Manuscript Descriptions, by Category

*Commentaries* are limited to 2500 words, and an abstract is not needed. While commentaries are peer-reviewed, they are typically not counted in the *JOEH* impact factor. However, commentaries are definitely useful to bridge the gap between practice and science. The commentary is a space to provide a concise summary of the impact of new regulations, health effect implications, or important gap in knowledge that affect the practice of occupational and environmental hygiene.

The structure loosely follows the pattern: background/overview, introduction, discussion, and conclusion. The objective should be quickly identified (e.g., by the end of the first paragraph), and the bulk of this manuscript should be allocated to the discussion. References are expected, particularly to support the authors' arguments and to distinguish between the authors' opinions from published findings. Figures and tables should be minimal (one should be sufficient).

Note that *Commentaries* that are a direct response for the purpose of criticism of an article published in *JOEH* are not appropriate. These should be submitted as *Letters to the Editor*.

### Letters to the Editor

The purpose of a *Letter to the Editor* is to provide additional insight or viewpoint on an article that appeared in the journal. A letter might be written to identify an error, provide an alternate theory, provide additional information, offer additional evidence, or provide a contrasting argument to that presented in the original article. Reasons for submitting a *Letter* to the *JOEH* include the following:

- An alternative argument to that posed in the original article
- An extension of the original article's argument using new information
- Experiences attempting to apply the information in the original article
- Argument about how the findings from the original article is applicable in other settings.

Letters addressing authors of a published article *must* be respectful, begin with a *concise* objective, provide specific examples on points of difference with reference to scientific evidence, and provide a conclusion. Since the word length is small, do not summarize the article: provide a reference so that readers can access the article itself. Begin with the clear objective of your letter, and end with a clear take-home message: end with a statement that helps the *JOEH* readers understand what to do with your new perspective or information. Rely on essential references when supporting your argument, as the *JOEH* allows up to five references in a

## JOEH Manuscript Descriptions, by Category

*Letter*. Similar to all other article types in the *JOEH*, personal conversations should not be referenced. Rather, letters should present the scientific basis for the points being made about the original article.

It is important to note that Letters appearing in the *JOEH* are not peer-reviewed articles, nor are they included in the impact factor of the journal. However, it is important to know that, as the editor, I may solicit opinion from experts in a particular subject matter relevant to the evaluation of the scientific basis for the letter. If there are questions or vagueness in the letter regarding the *Letter's* scientific assessment, these will be communicated to the *Letter* author, who may or may not be invited to resubmit the letter. In addition, the letter will be submitted, for comment, to the corresponding author of the article on which it is based; these authors will be invited to respond to the letter, which will then be shared with the author of the first letter.

If both letters pass the hurdle of fair, respectful and scientific validity, the letters will be published in the same issue, the response following the initiating letter. When letters are deemed by the editor and the publisher as not respectful or not useful to the scientific discussion of the issue, letters will be returned to the author(s) with requests to meet the publication guidelines for these letters. It is highly recommended to review *Letters to the Editor* in a variety of journals prior to composing and submitting a letter any journal.

Use the “cover letter” space on ScholarOne to provide context to your *Letter*. Here, identify the primary purpose of your *Letter to the Editor*, declare conflicts of interest, and provide a clear rationale as to why this letter should be published.

*Letters to the Editor* must be concise (750 word maximum), rely on five or fewer references. Neither tables nor figures should be submitted. No abstract or section headers are needed. Note that the *JOEH* does not publish *Letters* in direct response or critique to articles published in other journals.