

Advancing Strength and Performance Research in Discovery

Editorial

Corey A. Peacock¹

¹Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale FL, USA

Corresponding author: Corey A. Peacock, cpeacock@nova.edu

Open Access

Published: March 12, 2021



Copyright, 2021 by the authors. Published by Research Directs and the work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Research Directs in
Strength and
Performance: 2021,
Volume 1 (Issue 1): 1

About Research Directs

Research Directs is a series of open access journals dedicated to providing performance-based researchers with an affordable open access, peer-reviewed publishing platform. Research Directs in Strength and Performance (RDSP) provides a moderately broad scope to enhance basic, applied and real-world research in strength and performance. Topics can include, but are not limited to the following categories of research in the field: strength and conditioning, physiology, athlete monitoring, body composition, movement science, rehabilitation, sports technology, sports psychology and many strength and performance topics that impact training and sports. Furthermore, a goal of the journal is to publish concise manuscripts in strength and performance. Therefore, authors are encouraged to submit direct and abridged research that is focused and impactful to their own line of inquiry in the form of [Direct Original Research](#).

As explained on the journal's website, Direct Original Research is a type of manuscript designed to support research and discovery by publishing data in a direct manner that avoids excessive citations and unnecessary verbiage that limits the promptness of peer-review and publication. As always, quality is paramount in research and given today's fast-paced climate, it is also becoming imperative for scientific advancement. A Direct Original Research is the same as original research but written in a concise manner with the goal of providing direct and citable research in the field, at an enhanced rate.

Confirmation and Disconfirmation

To further scientific discovery, both significant and non-significant data is relevant. RDSP encourages authors to provide non-significant data when it supports or refutes competing or noncompeting theories. In addition to the significance levels, or lack thereof, real-world significance is an important factor to consider when publishing performance-related data. If significance is discovered, but not statistical significance, authors are encouraged to report the data and elaborate in detail regarding the findings and the impact the data may have on strength training and sport. When studying humans and strength training performance, it is well

understood that a great deal of variability in the data may occur. Moreover, outlier data is often omitted in the literature and RDSP is committed to providing a platform that encourages authors to submit data that supports positive or negative outcomes for outlier data. Further, while large sample sizes are ideal, they are not always feasible, especially within sport, competition, and training. Thus, the journal welcomes data from small data sets that warrants publication, because this type of data can often result in ideas for new and novel research.



Conclusions

In conclusion, the journal welcomes manuscripts from research studies guided by scientifically sound methodologies in strength and performance. The journal is committed to developing a rigorous peer-reviewed process that promotes scientific discovery via direct research. Previous research has been published to suggest the need for data to be reported as is, even if the results reveal significant or non-significant outcomes and RDSP is in support of this ideology⁴.

References

1. Arunachala L, Hunter IA, Killeen S. Reporting of Randomized Controlled Trials with Statistically No significant Primary Outcomes Published in High-impact Surgical Journals. *Ann Surg.* 2017; 265(6):1141-1145.
2. Chard PJC, Virile M, Head ML, Jenn ions MD. Evidence that no significant results are sometimes preferred: Reverse P-hacking or selective reporting. *Plops biology.* 2019; 17(1).
3. Gates S, Eagling E. Reporting and interpretation of results from clinical trials that did not claim a treatment difference: survey of four general medical journals. *BMJ Open.* 2019; 9(9).
4. Hazell L, Shaker SAW. Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions. *Drug Safety.* 2006; 29:385-396.