

Guidelines for Reviewers

We very appreciate the work of Reviewers for the success of this journal.

- 1 On receipt of Reviewer Invitation by Editorial Manager (Online Submission System <http://dzsm.edmgr.com>) please follow all instructions displayed.
- 2 If you agree the invitation to review the manuscript, a login with username and password is necessary. You can find the manuscript you are assigned for review by logging in as reviewed to your user profile. There will be a blank form to be fulfilled with your anonymous evaluation to the editors and further on with non-anonymous comments to the author(s). In this second part we ask you kindly to evaluate the publication generally and to display the strengths and weaknesses. Furthermore you should describe for the author(s) special details to be revised.
- 3 After finalization we ask you to submit your evaluation. Without this confirmation by hitting the submission button, the editors may not be able to see your comments.
- 4 Please finalize your evaluation within 4 weeks. If you are not possible to finalize within this time, please get in touch with the editorial manager.
- 5 Please identify a possible conflict of interest to the editors.

General Guidelines for Publications:

The main criteria due to the guidelines of the journal are the high quality, scientific interest and/or relevant for practice as well as new and important findings of publications. The style of the manuscripts should be written sententiously. In Originalia important sports medical knowledge of experimental and practical sports medicine should be displayed. They should not extend 2000 words. Reviews should give an overview of new scientific findings or relevant experiences from a general point of view. Citation of relevant and new references is expected. Clinical Case Reports and Epicrisis should be written sententiously and present and discuss a medical case and relevant medical references.

Special Guidelines for the Reviewing Process:

- 1 The aims of the publication are clearly identified?
- 2 The summary is informative, well-structured and contains aim, methods, results and conclusion in 200-230 words?
- 3 Key words are enclosed?
- 4 The results are comprehensive and clearly displayed? No results should be documented twice in figures, tables and text.
- 5 The statistical methods and the number of appropriate cases are sufficient and for the scientific question?
- 6 The references are presented completely and contain current and important primary publications? The citation guidelines have been respected? Thesis of examinations, diploma or similar as well as unpublished data cannot be cited (3rd level publications).
- 7 The tables and figures comply with the guidelines?
- 8 The discussion includes all significant scientific aspects?
- 9 The conclusion is based on the study data and not on speculation?

Principles of the Reviewing Process

In accordance with the German Journal of Sports Medicine – Deutsche Zeitschrift für Sportmedizin (www.germanjournalsportsmedicine.com) the agreement to the general accepted principles of good scientific and sports medical practice is valid.

The reviewing process aims to guarantee the quality assurance of the journal. Important aims of the reviewing process are the check of the relevance of a manuscript, the scientific credibility and formal aspects as completeness, style and comprehensibility. The evaluation serves as support for the author(s) relation to changes, reductions and inclusion of unnoticed aspects.

The reviewing process is led by the principle of fairness and care of the evaluation. The evaluation is done confidentially which means, a reviewer needs to handle all documents of the publication in strict confidence and under no circumstances may allow the access to third parties. Reviewers need to make objective decisions and inform the editors immediately about persisting conflicts of interests. This applies in particular to manuscripts of personal friends, colleagues or competitors if personal differences exist. In this cases, the editors decide on the reviewers' concerns.

Procedure of the Reviewing Process Extract of the Editorial Policies

- 1 The manuscript will then be sent to two other members of the Scientific Board of the Journal or to other scientific experts. The names of reviewers are blinded to the authors. The peer review includes a confidential judgement and an open part with general and especial indications and should be finished within 4 weeks.
- 2 The open part of peer review will be submitted to the authors together with the final decision of the Editorial Board concerning acceptance, revision with conditions or rejection of the manuscript.
- 3 The peer review process will be continued until a final decision about acceptance or rejection is made by the Editors.
- 4 Reviews and correspondence concerning the manuscripts will be kept on file for a reasonable period of time together with the manuscripts.