ISSN 0103-5150 Fisioter. Mov., Curitiba, v. 28, n. 2, p. 209-210, Apr./June 2015 Licenciado sob uma Licença Creative Commons DOI: http://dx.doi.org.10.1590/0103-5150.028.002.ED01



Editorial

Have you ever heard of Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle? You know, the observer influences the experiment?¹

That' one of the best quotes that the silly *Lolita* turned into a *genius* by the Woody Allen prototype of Humbert Humbert says to her *Romeo*. Naturally, this *being an Allen movie*, the dialogue continues in a comical and sexual approach of the observer effect but that, in the last instance, serves as an example of the dialogues between science and pop culture, between knowledge first as a conception and last as a *product*, available to everyone. Susan Sontag used to say that "the only interesting answers are those that destroy the questions". We could go further and say that the only interesting questions are those that expand answers to several fields and, why not, to the general public. One could claim that knowledge is always relevant. It is, although please allow us to openly admit that merely to fill shelves with books is less effective than turning some lights on.

With the focus on progress, scientific studies should bring new approaches to the old and open space to the new. Findings must be shared, but there are specific places (i.e. journals) for specific studies (hierarchy of importance), as well basic steps to be taken and rules to be respected.

As a Qualis B1 journal, the amount of manuscripts we receive is unimaginable, and as you all must know, submission, peer review and publication are time-consuming. The time lost in analyzing papers could be saved if authors didn't rely only on *headlines*. Reading instructions may be boring, but it is necessary. A manuscript can be of a great importance, however it will be promptly declined if it doesn't meet the journal's requirements of level and format. It's also very important that the authors follow every demand and deadline. Because all papers will be sent to at least two peer reviewers and most of them don't respect deadlines either, the expected one year period between submission and publication is usually delayed, once the peer reviewers

¹ Whatever Works. Written and directed by Woody Allen. 2009.

get overloaded and editors, consequently, have to analyze an increasing number of papers at a time. So much review may sound a bit over, but that's the only way to assure the quality we cherish and seek.

Taking Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle out of the quantum physics and bringing it to the academic universe, we can better explain the importance of this process: the so dreamt impartiality of journalism is a beautiful concept, but hard to achieve. Therefore, with peer review we ensure a more reliable and accurate (re)view on the studies, and giving the final answer to our editors, that having access to all papers submitted have a wider perspective of the whole, we can reach and satisfy a broader readership. That said, we kindly ask for the commitment and cooperation of each and everyone involved. As Alexander Graham Bell said, "great discoveries and improvements invariably involve the cooperation of many minds".

> Rubia Carolina Farias Santos Editorial Department

Dra Auristela Duarte Lima Moser, PhD Editor-in-Chief