

How to write for the Journal of the Association of Chartered Physiotherapists in Oncology and Palliative Care.

The journal is designed to enable the sharing of good practice, highlighting innovative care, evidence based practice and increasing research knowledge and awareness to physiotherapists working in the field of oncology and palliative care. Within our membership we have a huge range of expertise, knowledge, specialities and experience and we are really keen that this knowledge base is shared. It will also be an opportunity to open discussion and help the committee to plan future work. We hope to receive submissions for the journal from across all our membership, including experienced writers as well as those of you who have never published before. To help we have devised the following guidelines.

These guidelines have been based on the guidelines for submission to the journal of the Association of Chartered Physiotherapists in Respiratory Care, developed by Una Jones, Emma Chaplin and Harriet Shannon (http://www.acprc.org.uk/publications/acprc_journal_author_guidelines.asp)

Types of article that may be submitted:

- Empirical Research - research setting out to gather or generate new data to answer a question. May be quantitative or qualitative
- Case Study - usually describe an unusual case or condition, or a response to treatment that is unexpected
- Service Evaluation - written either to assess the value of a current service (may be monetary, may be other value) or to compare a new method of service delivery with a more established one. May also be used to justify staffing levels or highlight need for increased staffing.
- Literature Review - Review of available literature either to highlight where a gap is in knowledge, or to recommend best practice.
- Audit - a report of an audit, which measures current practice against a defined standard. Asks question - are we doing what we think we should be doing?

We will also consider submissions of the following types of article:

- Book reviews
- Abstracts (such as those submitted for poster presentation at conferences)
- Reviews/reflective pieces of the type submitted for academic credits

Please contact the journal editor for guidance on how to write these up if needed.

Empirical Research

Empirical Research is usually either qualitative or quantitative, although mixed methods research is becoming more widely used. Ethical approval is usually required for this type of research and evidence of appropriate approval will be required within your submission. Empirical research articles should usually be no more than 3,000 words long.

Quantitative studies usually answer 'what' or 'how' questions and may use a number of different experimental techniques. A specific research question and hypothesis is identified and an appropriate method of experimentation is chosen to collect data to answer this question.

Qualitative studies usually answer ‘why’ questions and are usually chosen for a deeper exploration of experiences or phenomena. A hypothesis is not normally identified, this method is often used to help develop evidence in a novel area.

The following tables provide information about what detail should be included in each type of empirical research.

Quantitative Studies

Title	The title should clearly state the research design, participants, the intervention, comparison and outcome measure used (if all applicable). eg The effect of multidimensional physiotherapy program on shoulder function, pain and lymphedema after surgery in elderly breast cancer patients
Abstract (approx 300 words)	The abstract should provide a summary of the rest of your article and should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your main objective • a brief description of the research design • the setting of the study (community, primary care, secondary care, hospice etc) • inclusion/exclusion criteria for participants • description of intervention/comparison, and outcome measure • main results and key data • overall conclusions It should not include any information not in the main body of the text
Introduction	Background to topic being studied, including any relevant previous research, gaps and weaknesses in this research. The introduction and background research should highlight the need for your study - why have you chosen to undertake this? Aims and objectives should be reported along with any hypotheses.
Methods	Clear description of what you actually did - someone should be able to replicate your study from this section. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants - inclusion and exclusion criteria, how and where they were recruited and selected. • Randomisation and blinding details if needed • Intervention - detailed description of your intervention, how and when it was administered • Description of outcome measures including references to reliability/validity if available. Details of how and when you used them. • Methods of data analysis including statistical test to be used if appropriate • Ethical Approval gained
Results	Clear description of the findings of the study. Descriptions of the flow of participants through the study including drop outs. A flow chart may help to represent this. Descriptive analysis of demographic data and main data set, including mean, standard deviation/median interquartile range. Analysis of main data set including confidence intervals and significance level if appropriate. Was the hypothesis supported? Tables, charts and graphs may enable you to present large amounts of data in a more succinct form. Comparisons between groups differences etc as relevant

Discussion and Conclusion	Should flow logically from the presentation of results. Should summarise the main findings of the study and should be related back to the literature review. Consider to what extent they support or refute previous evidence and what new knowledge they have identified. Strengths and limitations of the study should be identified and suggestion of further research to inform the area of practice may be made.
Acknowledgements	Acknowledgements should be provided for anyone who is not an author but has contributed to the article and also any funding provided for the study.
References	See below for referencing guidelines.

Qualitative Studies

Title	The title should clearly state the research design, the topic being studied and the participants eg Physiotherapy management of post-operative breast cancer patients: a qualitative study
Abstract (approx 300 words)	The abstract should provide a summary of the rest of your article and should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your main objective • a brief description of the research design • the setting of the study (community, primary care, secondary care, hospice etc) • inclusion/exclusion criteria for participants • methods of data collection • main results • overall conclusions It should not include any information not in the main body of the text
Introduction	Background to topic being studied, including any relevant previous research, gaps and weaknesses in this research. The introduction and background research should highlight the need for your study - why have you chosen to undertake this? Justification of the chosen method of study should be provided
Method	Clear description of what you actually did - someone should be able to replicate your study from this section. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants - inclusion and exclusion criteria, how and where they were recruited and selected. • Details of method used - interview, focus group etc. • Detailed description of how data was handled - transcription, verification etc • Description of how rigour of data collection was achieved • Detail of how data analysis was completed. • Ethical Approval gained
Results	Provide the results of the data analysis and example data items that characterise the main themes or ideas. Quotations should be written in italics with double quotation marks. Ensure confidentiality by not using any identifiable data. eg <i>"it was motivation, even in the space of 2 days I could see a difference"</i> [patient 4]

Discussion and Conclusion	Should flow logically from the presentation of results. Should summarise the main findings of the study and should be related back to the literature review. Consider to what extent they support or refute previous evidence and what new knowledge they have identified. Strengths and limitations of the study should be identified and suggestion of further research to inform the area of practice may be made.
Acknowledgements	Acknowledgements should be provided for anyone who is not an author but has contributed to the article and also any funding provided for the study.
References	See below for referencing guidelines.

Case Studies

Case studies can report unusual presentations of a more common condition, reports on rarer presentations or unexpected responses to treatments. Whilst case studies lack the rigour of large experimental studies they are important to highlight examples of difference from the “norm”. They are also useful as in rare disease it may be impossible to do large trials due to lack of participant numbers. You should aim for 1500-2000 words for a case study.

Title	The title should identify the research design and topic of study eg The role of physiotherapy in palliative care for the relief of constipation - a case report
Abstract	The abstract should provide a summary of the rest of your article and should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background to the case study • Brief description of the case • Brief evaluation of the case in the context of previous literature • Main conclusions/recommendations
Introduction	Should include a background to the topic. What is novel or interesting about the case study? Where does this case study sit in relation to previous research? Background information - pertinent information to the condition
Case Presentation	Clear description of the case and may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic data • Underlying condition, previous medical, medication, family and social history (if relevant to case) • Description of patients problems & any outcomes measured • Plan for care and actual care provided, including specific information about treatment provided if relevant, including outcomes of treatment. • Information about how and why treatment finished. • Highlight any key areas of interest
Discussion and Conclusion	Summarise the main findings of case study. Refer back to literature and where this case has differences or similarities to known literature. Evaluate case in terms of accuracy, validity and uniqueness. If relevant, make recommendations for further study.

Acknowledgements	Acknowledgements should be provided for anyone who is not an author but has contributed to the article and also any funding provided for the study.
References	See below for referencing guidelines.

Service Evaluation

Service Evaluations may be written either to assess the value of a current service (may be monetary value, or may be other value) or to compare a new method of service delivery with a more established one. They may also be used to justify staffing levels or highlight a need for increased staffing. The evaluation of the service may look at a patient-centred outcome, for example improvement in function or in experience of a service, a service-centred outcome, for example reduced waiting times or length of stay or a therapist-centred outcome such as stress levels within the therapy team. Choosing the right question is vital to ensure that you assess the service in the way that is necessary for your needs. The right question will then lead to the right outcome being measured.

Service evaluations would normally be 2000-2500 words

Title	The title should clearly state the service that has been evaluated and the context of that evaluation. eg An evaluation of a seven day community palliative care physiotherapy service
Abstract	The abstract should provide a summary of the rest of your article and should include an overview of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an overview of the purpose of the evaluation • the setting of the evaluation - community/hospice/hospital etc • description of the service and changes made • main findings • conclusion and recommendations
Introduction	Include a background to the purpose and context of the evaluation - why have you decided/needed to evaluate this service? The context may include socio-economic, environmental and historical issues and should reference literature rationalising the evaluation. This may include guidelines, hospital policies etc,
Method	Clear description of the service including (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rationale and objectives of the service • population for whom the service was designed • involvement of other organisations within the service • changes within service • costs of service & changes to this Clear description of the method of evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description of method - questionnaire? focus group? observation? • participants in the evaluation - numbers, characteristics, patients or staff? • method of data analysis
Results	A clear description of the findings of the study, may include qualitative and quantitative data, depending on how the evaluation was completed.

Discussion and Conclusion	Summarise the main findings of the study. Go on to discuss the findings in relation to professional practice, service organisation, previous or potential changes in policy or practice and previous research (as applicable). Discuss areas of strengths and weaknesses of your evaluation and discuss any recommendations you might make.
Acknowledgements	Acknowledgements should be provided for anyone who is not an author but has contributed to the article and also any funding provided for the study.
References	See below for referencing guidelines.

Literature Review

A literature review is a review of available literature, either to highlight where there is a gap in knowledge, or to recommend best practice. It may be completed prior to the planning of an experimental study. If there is a large amount of data on a particular topic that needs synthesising in a systematic way it can be helpful to summarise the findings in order to make recommendations. Literature reviews are often completed as part of Masters level study. A systematic review should be reported using the PRISMA checklist (<http://www.prisma-statement.org/statement.htm>). Literature reviews should normally be no more than 3000 words.

Title	Clearly identify the topic and the scope of the review, ensuring it is clear from the title that it is a literature review. The PICOS criteria may help you to define your review. The title should be a statement, not a question
Abstract	The abstract should provide a summary of the rest of your article and should include an overview of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an overview of the purpose of the review • specific objectives for the review • search criteria used • Study appraisal and synthesis method • results • limitations • conclusions
Introduction	Include a background and a purpose for the review in the context of what has already been researched. Should highlight importance of problem, e.g. number of people impacted by problem, nature of impact etc. Ensure you state a clear question using the PICOS criteria (participant, interventions, comparisons, outcome measure and study designs). Depending on problem you may need to be very specific (e.g. your participants may be women, with stage III breast cancer, between 50 and 70 years old, having received chemotherapy experiencing hot flushes) or more general (e.g. people with a palliative condition causing breathlessness). Your search strategy should be described clearly enough that someone else would be able to replicate it and find the same studies. It should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Databases searched • Dates included • search terms, including any MeSH terms used • Inclusion/exclusion criteria for studies You should then describe which method of appraisal of the studies you have used,

	e.g. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) or McMaster University Review Form and how many people have appraised these studies.
Review	The review should be presented as an analysis and synthesis of the data found. It should not simply be a description of each study included. You may need to subdivide your write up to address different parts of the question, depending on the data gained. Graphs/tables may help to display a large volume of data in an easy to read way. It should report the number of studies found (a PRISMA flow diagram may help to demonstrate this)
Conclusion	This section should provide a conclusion based on the analysis and synthesis of the studies found. It should relate back to the original question and either be able to answer this, or identify areas for further research.
Acknowledgements	Acknowledgements should be provided for anyone who is not an author but has contributed to the article and also any funding provided for the study.
References	See below for referencing guidelines.

Audit

An audit measures current practice against a defined standard. The standard may be national guidance or local policy. It should aim to improve the quality of patient care and asks the question - are we doing what we think we should be doing? If there is no standard to be measured against then primary research needs to be carried out. The audit should not involve anything being done to the patient that would not have been part of their usual care. Audits usually use quantitative data, often yes/no questions.

Audits should usually be no more than 2500 words

Title	The title should clearly state the service that has been audited and the context of that audit.
Abstract	The abstract should provide a summary of the rest of your article and should include an overview of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an overview of the reason for the audit • aim and objectives of the audit • identify what best practice is • how data was collected • results of audit - identify areas for improvement • actions to be taken
Introduction/ Method	Why was the topic selected? It may be that a service was identified as high risk or cost, a patient safety incident or complaint. It may be mandatory (e.g. comparison to HCPC standards or CQC requirements). Clearly state the aim of the audit (e.g. to improve the quality of clinical record keeping in the organisation) and the objectives (break down the steps required to achieve the aim). Identify what best practice is - what guidelines/policy have you referred to - and what your criteria and standards are (e.g. all entries must be signed - 100%) Report population for audit and how sample was identified, how data was collected, who collected and when. Details of analysis of data

Results	<p>Display results of audit clearly - tables or graphs may be useful</p> <p>The results should describe what data tells you about current practice</p> <p>Identify where standards have been met and where they have not been.</p> <p>Identify areas for improvement & highlight recommendations.</p> <p>Report limitations of the audit (e.g. difficulty accessing patient notes, incomplete notes causing difficulty in analysis).</p> <p>Specific areas of good practice could be included as short case studies.</p>
Action/Next Steps	<p>Specify actions to be taken - areas for improvement, person responsible (ensure confidentiality is maintained - consider using job titles) and dates for completion of action.</p> <p>When will the audit be recompleted? What would you hope to see improved?</p>
Acknowledgements	<p>Acknowledgements should be provided for anyone who is not an author but has contributed to the article and also any funding provided for the study.</p>
References	<p>See below for referencing guidelines.</p>

Referencing Guidelines

The Harvard style should be used in referencing your work. Even within this style there can be subtle differences in the way things are presented, therefore the follow is a guide on how to present your references.

Stage One – Citation within text

The author and date should be stated in brackets at the end of a sentence, before the full stop, or within the text as follows:

Studies have found this to be an effective treatment (Smith 2012).
Smith (2012) found this to be an effective treatment.

If there are two authors, include the second author using an “&”, if there are 3 or more, use “et al.”, as follows:

Woods & McIlroy (2013) found a prevalence of 57%.
Fatigue has been found to be a common symptom (Wilkinson et al. 2014).

Corporate authors, such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence or the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy are referred to using their full names in the first reference, but can then be shortened in subsequent references, as follows:

Guidelines by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) (2007) suggest.....
Patients should be provided with access to physiotherapy (NICE 2007).

If no date is available on the work, substitute the date with “n.d.”, for example:

Smith (n.d.) stated that.....

If an exact statement or quotation is to be used, a page number must be added to the reference. If the quote is less than one line long it should appear in the body of the text. If it is longer there should be a line space and an indent.

Murray (2015, p101) states that “background pain should be managed according to the World Health Organisation pain ladder”.

If the author has had more than one paper published in the same year these should be suffixed with a letter so that a reader can identify separate papers, as follows:

Jones (2005a, 2005b) reported on hot flushes in post menopausal women

Stage Two – Reference List

The reference list should appear at the end of the work, but before any appendices. The references are listed alphabetically according to the first author’s surname. The list should not be numbered or bulleted.

Journal Articles

The sequence for a journal article is as follows:

Author surname and initials (final two authors separated by “and”); Year of publication (in brackets); title of article; title of journal (in italics); volume number followed by issue number (in brackets); page numbers

Example:

Hamilton L, Rosberg N and Alonso F (2009) A qualitative review of palliative patients experiences of falling. *Journal of Palliative Experiences* 21(4): 104-115

If there is a paper and electronic copy of an article the paper copy should be referenced. If there is no paper version the electronic form should be referenced as follows:

Hamilton L, Rosberg N and Alonso F (2009) A qualitative review of palliative patients experiences of falling. *Journal of Palliative Experiences* [online] 23 Available at: www.journalofpalliativeexperiences.com/content/1492-1245.pdf [Accessed 10 November 2014].

Books

The sequence for a book is as follows:

Author surname and initials (final two authors separated by “and”); Year of publication (in brackets); title of chapter followed by IN: Editors surname and initials followed by (ed/eds); title of book (in italics); place of publication: publisher; page numbers of chapter

Example:

Button J and Massa F (2013) Biology of pain IN: Jordan E and Williams F (eds) *Cancer Pain* London: Ecclestone Publishing 30-48

Website

Author surname and initials (or website owner); year of publication (in brackets); title of the webpage (in italics) Available from: URL [Date Accessed]

Example:

National Institute for Excellent Physiotherapy (2014) *The value of physiotherapy in cancer care* Available from: <http://www.excellentphysiotherapy.co.uk/value-in-cancer> [Accessed 15 November 2014]

For further referencing guidelines please contact the research officer in ACPOPC.

Formatting for Submission

Font

All text should be arial. Title should be 16pt, Author Name in 14pt and the main text in 12pt. Please double space the main text & number all pages.

Title Page

Please include a title page as the first page of the document including the following information:

- Title of the article
- Names and initials of each author, institutional affiliation of each author
- Dull details of each authors current role/job title
- Name, email address and telephone number of main author, responsible for correspondence.
- Word Count (excluding summary)

Please email all submissions to the Journal Editor – contact details can be found on ACPOPC website (<http://acpopc.csp.org.uk/>)