Reasons Research publications are rejected

(Applicable to journal article, dissertation, thesis and grant proposals)

-and which lessons of www.p3r.in offer a solution.

Who says this?	Reason of rejection	Module /lesson of www. p3r.in As a solution
1. *- Richard B. Primack Editor in Chief, Biological Conservation Biology Department, Boston University, 5 Cummington St. Boston, MA 02215, United States*	1. Writing style and overall presentation are poor. 2. Higher rates of acceptance from papers coming from developed countries where English is the first language. The combination of good resources for research and the ability to write in English certainly gives authors in these countries an advantage	*Entire E-LEARNING of www.p3r.in has been formulated to address these issues in detail.*
2. *University of Minnesota guidelines for rejection Set I: Adapted from: Bordage, G. (2001). Reasons reviewers reject*	1.Inappropriate or incomplete statistics 2.Over-interpretation of results 3.Text difficult to follow 4. Insufficient problem statement 5.Inaccurate or inconsistent data	1. *-M 1. L 4-Ouantitative and numerical expression* 2. *M 3.L 3 Standard structure-IMRAD* 3. *M2-Grammar.M 2-Punctuation* 4. *M 3.L 3 Standard structure-IMRAD* 5. *M 1. L 4-Ouantitative and numerical*

and accept manuscripts: Academic Medicine, vol. 76(9): 889-896	reported 6. Incomplete, inaccurate, or outdated review of the literature 7.Insufficient data presented 8. Defective tables or figures	*expression* 6*. M3 L1-Search and Literature review* 7.*M 6 L 2 Checks and revisions* 8.*M 4-L2-Tables M 4-L3 Graphs and charts*
University of Minnesota guidelines for rejection Set II: From Pierson, D. J. (2004). The top 10 reasons why manuscripts are not accepted for publication. Respiratory Care, 49(10): 1246-1252	1. Picking the wrong journal 2. Submitting a manuscript in a format that does not match what the journal published 3. Not following the manuscript preparation instructions 4. Poor writing 5. Getting carried away in the discussion 6. Sub-optimal reporting of the methods 7. Inadequate description of the methods 8. Poor study design 9. Failure to revise and resubmit	1.*M5 L5-Journal Articles* *2.M3 L2-Preparation and planning* *3. M3 L2-Preparation and planning* *4. M2-Grammar.M 2-Punctuation* *M1 L2-Attributes of scientific language* *M1 L3-Style and word usage* *5.M 3 L3-Standard structure IMRAD* *6. Standard structure IMRAD* *7. Standard structure IMRAD* *8. M3 L2-Preparation and planning* *9. M6 L3-Peer review process* *10.M6 L 2-Checks and revisions*

	following peer review 10. Failure to write and submit a full manuscript after presenting the abstract	
Peter Thrower, PhD Editor-in-Chief of Carbon, the international journal of the American Carbon Society, and Professor Emeritus of Material Sciences and Engineering at Penn State University	1. The article contains elements that are suspected to be plagiarized. 2. The manuscript is not complete; it may be lacking key elements such as the title, authors, affiliations, keywords, main text, references and all tables and figures. 3. The English is not sufficient for the peer review process. 4. The figures are not complete or are not clear enough to read. 5. The language, structure, or figures are so poor that the merit can't be assessed. Have a native English speaker read the paper. Even if you ARE a native English speaker.	*1.M 3 L4-Avoiding plagiarism* *2. M 6 L 2 Checks and revisions* *3.M1 L2-Attributes of scientific language* *M1 L3-Style and word usage* *M6 L3-Peer review process* *4.M4 total – Use of visuals to present information* *5. M2-Grammar.M 2-Punctuation* *M1 L2-Attributes of scientific language* *M1 L3-Style and word usage* *M7 L1-Writing for n international audience*