



Additional author guidelines

Dear authors,

we would like to address some aspects for your consideration according to our peer review process and to secure the quality of our journal. Please double check your article according to the following content:

Cover letter

When submitting your Manuscript, please be sure to enhance it by a brief summary in form of a Cover Letter, stating your Manuscript's contribution to and position in the specific research field. The Cover Letter should not exceed the length of 400 words, equivalent to approximately 1 PDF page. In regards of language style, please avoid using overly technical language or non-standard acronyms.

In order to identify the most appropriate reviewers for your research, the purpose of your Cover Letter should be to set forth the novelty and importance of your research to a non-expert. This way, categorization processes can be carried out much more efficiently by our chief editors.

Preceded quality check

Before your paper will be assigned for reviewing procedure, it is going to be subjected to a standardized quality check including the following six requirements:

1. The article title should be same in the submission step, Title Page and Blinded Manuscript.
2. The order of authors in the submission step and the title page file should be same.
3. The abstract in the submission step and Blinded Manuscript should be same.
4. Only the Title Page should contain the author information.
5. The file names should not contain author name.
6. Conflict of Interest statement should be included in the letter to the editor and at the end of the manuscript.
7. The citation and reference standard should follow the actual APA guidelines.

Structure of the manuscript

1. The abstract of the manuscript should be structured (150-250 words) including the sections: Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion
2. In line with the abstract especially manuscripts of original research including qualitative or quantitative data as well systematic reviews should be provided with the following sections: Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion (including strength and limitations), Conclusion, References in addition to a blinded section of Acknowledgements and Conflict of Interests.
3. We highly recommend using common reporting guidelines to secure the reporting quality of your manuscript, e.g., the CONSORT statement for randomized controlled trails or the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews. Potential guidelines according to the nature of your study design can be found here: <https://www.equator-network.org/>. The belonging checklists should be added and submitted as supplemental material.

Guidance for communication while reviewing procedure

We see ourselves as a platform covering a wide spectrum of Sport Research related disciplines, reaching from hermeneutic to quantitative issues. Therefore, we refrain of specifying particular instructions concerning nomenclature and substance of Manuscript headlines.

Instead – in order to obtain an economic and pleasant reviewing procedure for both parties – the following can be understood as a guideline to successful communication in context of reviewing matters and response letters.

Openness and kindness

Please always be open to critical remarks on the part of our reviewers. We are always striving for you to unfold the maximum potential quality of your paper, so that the scientific standard is being maximized throughout the reviewing process. Therefore, we kindly ask you to be respectful and courteous while communicating with our reviewers, as you are welcome to expect the same vice versa.

Reacting to annotations step by step

When receiving back your reviewed paper, you will certainly find some annotations made by our reviewers including subject-specific commentaries. For the purpose of economizing reviewing procedures and increasing the probability of publication please give an explicit reaction (point-by-point) to every remark made by the reviewers.

Respond properly to disagreements.

Discussions are immanent to scientific discourse – consequently, you do not have to agree with the reviewers' remarks in every aspect. If you do not consent with an annotation, please make sure to adequately constitute your point of view on the matter, so that an ongoing revision can be pursued. You may also refer to further literature to underline your arguments.