



How to Avoid Manuscript Rejection: Common Reasons for Rejection of Manuscript

Prakash Patel¹

Key words: Manuscript rejection, editorial review, peer review, scope of the journal

A research manuscript published in a national or international journal of repute is essentially regarded as an outcome of a good research study by researcher. After the author(s) put in a lot of effort and commitment to inscribe, each manuscript, when completed, is sent to a journal for publication, where it is selected depending on the topic of the manuscript and the broad field of the journal and its scope.

DENIAL DUE TO OUT OF SCOPE OF THE JOURNAL

Before sending the manuscript, it is the duty of the author(s) to understand the scope of the journal and make sure the topic of the manuscript fulfils the journals' requirements. This will allow for avoiding unnecessary delays.

The Editor-in-Chief with the editorial staff decide whether the manuscript deserves to be sent for reviewing to the related reviewers. About 20-30% of the manuscripts can very quickly be categorized as unsuitable or beyond the scope of the journal. Thus, they reject the manuscript even without sending it to the reviewer.

REASONS FOR DENIAL AT EDITORIAL LEVEL

There are a variety of causes for this; the most common (non-limiting) ones are listed below:

- Lack of Novelty, originality, and presentation of obsolete study: The primary qualities that a scientific journal editor emphasizes the most are novelty and non-obviousness.
 - Improper rationale: The goal of research is to make a point with adequate explanations and sufficient data. The rationale, which should be the article's fundamental point, should be the focus of
- the entire document. The last sentence in the introductory section should usually contain the goal(s) and objective(s). Rejection is caused by a lack of focus and failure to stick to the manuscript's concept.
 - Unimportant and irrelevant subject matter: Knowledge is disseminated through peer-reviewed journal publications. As a result, an article must have significant scientific merit in order to be published in a well-recognized, worldwide publication.
 - Flaws in methodology: Some manuscripts show that the work done in the research study was done incorrectly. This is due to the researcher's lack of understanding, as seen by the poor literature review conducted prior to beginning the job. This may or may not be reflected in the reviewers' remarks to the author, but it could be shared with the Editor-in-Chief in the confidential comments. If a study's methodology is defective or dubious, the results are almost certain to be problematic or dubious as well, and many highly regarded peer-reviewed publications will not accept such a study.
 - Lack of interpretations: The researcher must have sufficient knowledge to interpret the precise causes for the study's findings. Even if the results aren't exactly what the author expected, the author should be able to critically assess the reason in the discussion section. It is not necessary to only display positive outcomes. If the root cause of the bad outcomes is correctly interpreted, manuscripts can aid future study.
 - Inappropriate or incomplete statistics: The use of statistics in the methods and results parts of a publication gives it an advantage over the compe-

How to cite this article: Patel P. How to Avoid Manuscript Rejection: Common Reasons for Rejection of Manuscript. Natl J Community Med 2022;13(6):349-351. DOI: 10.55489/njcm.130620222179

Financial Support: None declared

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Date of Submission: 05-06-2022

Date of Acceptance: 17-06-2022

Date of Publication: 30-06-2022

Correspondence: Dr. Prakash Patel (Email: drpbpatel@gmail.com)

Copy Right: The Authors retain the copyrights of this article, with first publication rights granted to Medsci Publications.

tion, as statistics is currently in demand. The probability of the manuscript being accepted will be increased if the data are presented precisely and statistical concepts are applied.

- The manuscript was packaged incorrectly: A less-than-borderline piece may be published in some situations provided it is well-packaged. It can be difficult for an assessor to tell the difference between 'introduction' and 'conversation' in some circumstances. The purpose of the introduction is to introduce the study topic and to state the article's objective(s) and/or goal(s). The purpose of the 'discussion' is to debate the research, making comparisons to past studies, and interpreting the findings. The 'materials and methods' section should be comprehensive enough that any reader may replicate the study. The 'Discussion' must be pertinent to the research. Previous research that supports or contradicts the current study should be cited. It's best to avoid relying on assumptions and guesswork. Any significant assertion that isn't a direct outcome of the research should be accompanied by a citation. The conversation should be restricted to the topics that have been researched.
- Popularity of journals and the editor's priority for the manuscript: Some papers have potential, but due to the popularity of the journal and the vast number of hits to the journal, prospective manuscripts must be refused since they face stiff competition from the Editor-in-higher-graded Chief's research manuscripts. If a work is rejected on these grounds, it will eventually find a home in another well-regarded journal.

REASON FOR REJECTION AFTER PEER REVIEW

Major (non-limiting) causes for a review article being rejected have been discussed.

- Incomplete data such as too small a sample size or missing or poor controls
- Poor analysis such as using inappropriate statistical tests or a lack of statistics altogether
- Inappropriate methodology for answering your hypothesis or using old methodology that has been surpassed by newer, more powerful methods that provide more robust results
- Weak research motive where your hypothesis is not clear or scientifically valid, or your data does not answer the question posed
- Inaccurate conclusions on assumptions that are not supported by your data
- Poor presentation – poor elaboration of method/poor writing/poor presentation of results

- Design flaws like inappropriate study design for the stated objectives, lack of control group, poor control of confounder, weak methodology
- Ethical issue – No or improper informed consent/assent/IEC approval, Plagiarism, Duplicate submission, necessary approval from authorities whenever required.
- Inadequate compliance to the previous comments

OTHER ADDITIONAL REASON FOR REJECTION

The reasons discussed earlier are chiefly the ones due to which the manuscript becomes liable for rejection. Other additional reasons that may play their part adding to the above-mentioned reasons, irrespective of the journal type may be:

- Favoritism or partiality based on the country of origin of the manuscript (less often, but still cannot be completely ruled out)
- Missing Conflict of Interest statement
- Improper manuscript uploading in the journals' author center (this may add to the frustration of the Editor-in-Chief)
- Missing covering letter or with improper authors' affiliations
- Improper formatting and language, grammatical lapses, and typographic errors
- Inadequate corrections of galley proofs: Galley proofs should be corrected 'boldly' preferably with a red pen so that the printer can easily see it, and not corrected on a separate sheet of paper. In addition, most journals send them along with author queries (AQ) and instructions to be followed for correcting the galley proofs
- Inappropriate reference citations ignoring the journals' format
- Abstract not given as per journals requirements: Some journals require a brief (< 200 words) synopsis clearly outlining the scene and article scope, briefly putting it into context. The aim of the abstract is to draw in the interested reader, so a clearer and more insightful abstract will generate more interest and will make the manuscript attractive.
- Other factors such as file formatting, spacing, and headings, units and abbreviations, spellings, companies and drug brand names, bibliography, tables, illustrations, chemical structures, submission deadlines (in case of invited reviews), copyright forms submission at appropriate time, grammatical and syntax errors, and so on are all to be taken care of for every specific journal, having distinct requirements for each. Failure to meet the above-mentioned criteria may not necessarily reject the manuscript, but can delay the publica-

tion of your manuscript adding to unnecessary afflictions.

MANUSCRIPT REJECTION: IS IT THE END OF THE WORLD FOR THAT MANUSCRIPT?

Clearly not. Recognize that there are a variety of causes for rejection.

As previously said, publishers are frequently seeking for something very particular. Don't be disappointed or offended, and don't take it personally. An anonymous person examines your text and makes a decision based on a set of pre-determined criteria. Respect his opinions; one should be mature enough to discern whether the opinions expressed are genuine or only produced for the purpose of writing.

Re-energize yourself by reading your essay again and considering whether it may be improved in any way, as well as any of the reviewers' remarks. Authors must learn to be their own best editor, critic, and cheerleader. Read your article with a critical eye to determine whether it wanders off topic, states a

problem that isn't solved, or repeats the same argument numerous times. Request that a rival or a peer group with knowledge of the subject read it and provide additional feedback.

Improve the manuscript in light of the reviewers' suggestions and resubmit it to the same journal. If your manuscript is rejected by one publication, try another, and another, and another! To summarise, conducting research is not easy, and having your work approved and published in a reputable publication only adds to the complication. It will literally transport you to the competition field. Although there is no shortage of promising papers waiting to be published in reputable journals, high-level research and accompanying well-drafted articles will finally win the race.

The author is Associate Professor in Community Medicine Department at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research (SMIMER), Surat, India. He has more than 15 years of experience of working in bio-medical research.