Human Movement Author Guidelines

1. The Human Movement quarterly (hereafter referred to as HM) is a peer-reviewed scientific journal published by the University School of Physical Education in Wroclaw, Poland.

2. The Editorial Office of HM (hereafter referred to as the Editor) accepts scientific papers, not published anywhere before, concerning human movement within the scope of sports medicine, physical effort physiology, biomechanics, motor activity, psychology. A scientific paper, in accordance with the regulations of the Statement of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of June 2, 2015 on the criteria and procedure of scientific journals assessment, is a paper presenting results of original research of empirical, theoretical, technical, or analytical character, and communicating the present state of the art, the research methods, the course of the research process, its results and conclusions, along with the indication of the quoted literature (bibliography). Scientific papers also include studies of monographic, polemical, or review character, as well as glosses or juridical comments. The Editor also accepts letters the Editor, scientific conferences reports, and book reviews.

3. Only papers written in English are accepted.

4. By submitting a paper, the author agrees to accept the Editor’s procedures of qualifying papers for publication and the ‘Instructions on submitting and preparing articles’ (Appendix 1 to these Author Guidelines).

5. The paper is subject to a two-step qualification procedure: (1) formal internal assessment, performed by the Editor-in-Chief and the editorial team (verification of the article compliance with the journal’s profile and technical requirements); (2) external review – performed by two independent reviewers, appointed by the Editor-in-Chief. In addition, empirical papers in which statistical methods were applied undergo verification by a statistical editor.

6. The Author can suggest reviewers, but the Editor reserves the right to the final selection.

7. Reviewers are senior academic staff members or academics at least with the scientific degree of a doctor, competent within the merits of the paper. Reviewers are independent: not affiliated in the same research unit as the author of the publication.

8. The review procedures are consistent with the regulations and recommendations of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education.

9. Papers are accepted for publication after being reviewed favourably by two independent reviewers. If the reviews are contradictory, the third reviewer is appointed, whose opinion becomes decisive.

10. Reviews are drawn up in writing, in a review sheet, which obliges the reviewer to formulate an unequivocal conclusion about accepting the paper for publication or rejecting it.

11. The author and the reviewer remain anonymous to each other (double blind review process). Otherwise, the reviewer is obliged to declare no conflict of
interest; what is referred to as conflict of interest is a direct personal relationship between the reviewer and the author (kinship, legal relationship, conflict); professional dependence relationship; direct research cooperation within the two years prior to the paper reviewing.

12. Names of the reviewers are not revealed. Once a year, the Editor provides a general list of the cooperating reviewers.

13. The author is informed about the review results and the reviewers’ comments, so that they can correct the paper in accordance with the provided directions.

14. The Editor reserves the right to introduce corrections in the paper. An article that does not follow the guidelines can be returned to the author for adjustments.

15. The Editor reserves the right to reject a paper which is not consistent with the journal profile; does not meet the requirements imposed on scientific papers; has received two negative scientific reviews; does not follow the ‘Instructions on submitting and preparing articles’ (Appendix 1 to these Author Guidelines); has not been corrected in accordance with the directions of the Editor or the reviewers; bears attributes of plagiarism.

16. The final decision on accepting a paper for publication or rejecting it is always taken by the Editor-in-Chief.

17. In the case of a justified lack of publication of a submitted paper, the Editor does not return the costs borne by the author (processing fee).

18. The author is obliged to sign the licence, consequently giving their consent to publicize the paper in print, on magnetic or digital carriers, and on the Internet. If the article is an output of cooperation with other authors, the main author is obliged to provide licences signed by all co-authors and to inform them about the conditions included in the journal guidelines.

19. The author is obliged to provide a statement concerning the ethical procedures effective in scientific research, and to reveal the input of particular authors in the creation of the paper (giving their affiliations and contribution, i.e. information about the authorship of the concept, assumptions, methods, protocol etc. employed in the preparation of the article); the main responsibility rests with the author submitting the paper.

20. All experiments employing human or animal subjects must obtain approval of an appropriate research ethics committee or the National Ethics Committee on Animal Experiments on implementing the methods suggested by the author in the experiment (a copy of the approval document must be attached to the paper).

21. Author is responsible for obtaining permission to reproduce any material used in their manuscripts that is protected by copyright.

22. A person who performed statistical calculations only, prepared solely the bibliographic list, or merely organized or funded the research cannot be referred to as author.

23. The Editor will not accept a paper which employs ghostwriting or guest authorship, and will disclose all such practices, especially symptoms of scientific dishonesty (breaking or compromising the ethical principles effective in scientific research) and plagiarism.
24. The author accepts that a submitted manuscript may be screened for plagiarism against previously published works. Manuscripts that are found to have been plagiarized will incur plagiarism sanctions: immediate rejection of the submitted manuscript or published article, prohibition of any new submissions.

25. The authors are obliged to provide the sources of financing the paper, as well as any input of research and development institutions, associations, or other entities (financial disclosure).

26. The papers published in HM are, as a whole (together with the correspondence data), made accessible in the Internet version of the journal and in the bases in which it is indexed.

27. The author receives neither royalty for the published paper nor a journal copy; they are provided solely with a PDF file with the published article.

28. The author is obliged to protect the personal data of the research participants. If the information included in the paper allows, in any way, to identify the study subjects, the author has to obtain their written consent for the publication of the research outcomes, including photographs, before submitting the paper for printing.

29. The author accepts the responsibility to introduce the corrections resulting from the review and send the paper back within 1 week.

30. The author is obliged to cooperate with the publishing editor and the linguistic and statistical proofreaders in order to clarify any ambiguities and correct deficiencies. Lack of the author’s response to the editorial remarks within a week shall denote their consent for introducing the suggested changes.

31. In the case of a significant delay in the appointed deadline for introducing corrections by the author, the Editor reserves the right to reschedule the paper to the subsequent HM volume.

32. The author should list all the people or institutions that contributed to the preparation of the paper, served as consultants, or provided financial or technical support.

33. The original (the reference) version of HM is the electronic edition.

34. The Editor shall disclose all cases of scientific dishonesty, including notifying appropriate entities (institutions employing the authors, scientific associations, associations of scientific editors, etc.). The Editor is obliged to document any symptoms of scientific dishonesty, especially of breaking or compromising the ethical principles effective in scientific research.