



Important author information

Dear authors,
we would like to take this opportunity to provide you with some additional information on the preparation of your manuscript, which should facilitate and support the review process and help you to comply with the quality standards of the *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research (GJESR)*. We expressly ask you to follow these instructions in order to avoid a potential rejection of your contribution for formal reasons. Please consider the following points when submitting your paper:

Cover or correspondence letter

When submitting your manuscript, please be sure to include a brief explanation in the form of a cover letter in which you explain the contribution and classification of your manuscript in the respective research field. The cover letter should not exceed 400 words or one page. With regard to language style, please avoid the use of non-standardized acronyms. The purpose of the cover letter should be to explain the novelty and significance of your research in a generally understandable way. This will enable our editors to carry out editorial assignment processes and the acquisition of reviewers much more efficiently.

Quality check of the manuscript

Before your paper is accepted for the review process, it will undergo a standardized quality check, which includes the following requirements:

1. the title of the article must be identical in the submission step, on the title page and in the blinded manuscript.
2. for articles with several authors, their order in the submission step and in the title page file must be identical.
3. the abstract in the submission step and in the blinded manuscript must be identical.
4. only the title page should contain information on the authors.
5. the file names should not contain the names of authors.
6. the declaration of conflicts of interest should be included in the cover letter. In addition, the declaration should be inserted blinded at the end of the manuscript.
7. a blinded section on the contributions of the individual authors to the manuscript should be integrated at the end of the manuscript.
8. the citation style must follow the current APA guidelines (in text and in the references section) and not be realized via footnotes.

Guidelines for the manuscript structure for different types of articles

1. Classic empirical articles and systematic reviews

Each manuscript of original empirical studies including qualitative or quantitative data and systematic reviews should contain a structured abstract (150-250 words) comprising the sections Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion.

In line with the summary/abstract, manuscripts of original empirical studies and systematic reviews in particular should include the following sections:

- Introduction (including the theoretical background or theoretical derivation of the research question(s))
- Methods

- Results
- Discussion (including strengths and limitations)
- Conclusion
- References and a blinded “Acknowledgments and Conflicts of Interest” section.

We strongly recommend that you use standardized reporting guidelines to ensure the quality of your manuscript. These guidelines provide you as the author with orientation and can be specified according to your subject area if necessary. These include, for example, the COREQ or SRQR standards for qualitative studies, STROBE for epidemiological studies, the CONSORT statement for randomized controlled trials or the PRISMA or MOOSE guidelines for systematic reviews. Further possible guidelines according to the type of your study design can be found here: <https://www.equator-network.org/>. The checklists used should be added as supplementary material. You can indicate and/or comment on aspects or criteria that are not applicable to your study.

2. Non-empirical and non-classically structured empirical articles

For other article formats, a structured abstract (150-250 words) should also be integrated if possible and the following structure should be adhered to:

- Presentation of the scientific concern/question or problem
- Presentation and reflection of the theoretical framework, clarification of the working terms
- Methodological and methodological clarification
- Work with the material relevant to the scientific question/problem
- Balance in relation to the question or problem statement
- References and a blinded section on “Acknowledgements, conflicts of interest and contributions of the individual authors involved”

3. Study protocols

The *GJESR* is introducing this new manuscript format to give authors the opportunity to publish early scientific documentation of planned studies. In line with Open Science, only protocol manuscripts of planned or ongoing studies should be submitted. Therefore, only study protocol manuscripts for planned or ongoing studies for which recruitment of study participants has not yet been completed at the time of submission will be considered. The ongoing recruitment of study participants must be confirmed in the cover letter at the time of submission.

The publication of study protocols enables researchers and funding organizations to gain early access to current research projects and activities. This can help to avoid unnecessary redundancies in research projects, accelerate innovation and scientific development and promote collaboration between researchers. The publication of study protocols contains more and more detailed information than publication in study registers. This creates more transparency and enables reviewers and the professional public to recognize and understand deviations from the study protocol that occur during the implementation and/or evaluation of a research project.

The *GJESR* aims to publish study protocols that describe aspects of the design, conduct and/or reporting of randomized or quasi-randomized studies. However, other relevant study designs, e.g. studies investigating the development of core outcome sets for use in trials and process evaluations, in the field of interdisciplinary sports science are also welcome. Please follow the relevant reporting guidelines for the presentation of your study (<https://www.equator->

[network.org/?post_type=eq_guidelines&eq_guidelines_study_design=study-protocols&eq_guidelines_clinical_specialty=0&eq_guidelines_report_section=0&s=+](https://www.equator-network.org/?post_type=eq_guidelines&eq_guidelines_study_design=study-protocols&eq_guidelines_clinical_specialty=0&eq_guidelines_report_section=0&s=+)) and attach the relevant checklist as an additional file.

All submitted manuscripts must have a valid and qualified ethics vote. Study protocols without such a vote will not be considered.

According to the guidelines for study protocols mentioned above, the statistical analysis plan (if applicable) should be integrated directly into the study protocol or attached as an additional file for submission.

In summary, manuscripts for study protocols must contain at least the following points:

- Study protocol articles should report planned or ongoing studies. Manuscripts that report work that has already been conducted are not considered protocols. The status of data collection of the study must be reported in the manuscript and in the cover letter.
- Study protocols for studies requiring ethical approval will not be considered without a positive ethics vote.
- The structure of the manuscript must be structured according to the checklist used (see above).

Additional files for study protocols

When submitting, the following documents should be uploaded as additional files:

A **completed SPIRIT checklist** or checklist for another appropriate reporting guideline. The SPIRIT checklist can be downloaded here: www.goodreports.org/reporting-checklists/spirit/. The figure according to the SPIRIT checklist must be included in the main body of the text and the checklist (see https://www.equator-network.org/?post_type=eq_guidelines&eq_guidelines_study_design=study-protocols&eq_guidelines_clinical_specialty=0&eq_guidelines_report_section=0&s=) must be provided as an additional file. Both the figure and the checklist should be referenced in the text.

It is assumed that certain aspects of some study protocols do not fully comply with every point of the reporting guideline (e.g. SPIRIT). If used, the checklist is not intended as a tool for assessing the suitability of manuscripts for publication, but rather as a tool for authors to make clear, complete and transparent to reviewers and readers what the authors intend. If a point is not applicable, a brief explanation should be added as to why the point is not applicable.

If a study protocol for systematic reviews is to be published, the PRISMA-P (Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols, to be found here: <https://www.equator-network.org/>) guideline should be used and a completed PRISMA-P checklist uploaded with the protocol submission.

We also strongly recommend that you register your study. Prospective registration is mandatory for clinical trials. Acceptable registries for clinical trials include clinicaltrials.gov, but also the German registry: [https://www.bfarm.de/DE/Das-BfArM/Aufgaben/Deutsches-Register-Klinischer-Studien/ node.html](https://www.bfarm.de/DE/Das-BfArM/Aufgaben/Deutsches-Register-Klinischer-Studien/node.html)

We recommend Prospero for the registration of systematic reviews and the corresponding indication of the registration number in the manuscript.

Communication during the review process

In addition to the formal requirements mentioned above, we ask that the following principles be taken into account in the publication process:

Guidelines for communication during the review process

We see our journal as a platform that covers a broad spectrum of sports research-related disciplines, from hermeneutic to quantitative questions. We therefore refrain from providing specific information on the nomenclature and content of the manuscript headings.

Rather, in order to achieve an economical and satisfactory review process for both sides, the following aspects can be understood as guidelines for successful communication in the context of reviews and revisions.

Openness and appreciation

Please be open to critical comments from our reviewers. An appreciative attitude promotes academic discourse and understanding between reviewers, editors and authors. Critical comments serve the quality assurance and quality development of the scientific contributions. In this way, scientific standards can be ensured. We therefore ask you to be respectful and appreciative in your communication.

Respond to comments point by point

When you receive your reviewed paper back, you will usually find some comments from our reviewers in the correspondence, including subject-specific comments. In order to simplify the review process and increase the likelihood of publication, please provide an explicit (point-by-point) response to each comment from the reviewers and editors, regardless of whether you agree with the respective suggestion or point of criticism or wish to reject it with reasons. You should also color-code the relevant changes in the manuscript (e.g. by using the correction mode or highlight by a color).

Entering into a scientific discourse

Discussion is intrinsic to scientific discourse. It is therefore possible that you may not agree with all the points made by the experts. If you disagree with a proposal and do not wish to implement it, please make sure that you explain your position on the matter appropriately so that it can be understood in a possible further review round. You can also refer to further literature to substantiate your arguments. Please also note that some points of criticism may provide helpful feedback, even if you do not agree with them in their entirety. For example, sometimes misleading or imprecise formulations are revealed in the manuscript, which can be resolved by clarifying the language.