ABSTRACT FINAL REPORT

Abstract 19

General Information

Title	:	Dr.
FirstName	:	Hemant
LastName	:	Jain
Email ID	:	drhemantjain@jcdr.net
InstituteName	:	
Department	:	
Address	:	1/9 roop nagar
City/Zipcode	:	Delhi / 110007
State	:	Delhi
Country	:	India
PhoneNo	:	
Mobile No	:	9958727205

Abstract Information

Abstract Title : "WHY WE SAY NO!! A LOOK THROUGH THE EDITOR'S EYE"

Abstract : Background: Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research (JCDR) is a wide scope, multispecialty journal, both in print and online. The total number of submitted articles till 2015 July, have crossed 15000 of which around 4700 have been published. Since its nine years of inception, it has come across many articles that were rejected for various reasons. It was felt that an objective analysis of these rejections is required and hence the present study was conducted for self analysis, future planning and author aid. Methods and Material: Retrospective analysis of 1000 consecutive medical and dental articles since 1st august 2014 was done. Only those articles that reached the end point on decision were considered. When there were multiple reasons of rejection and all of them were critical, then they were counted under all the categories. Results: Out of the 1000 consecutive articles, 378 were of dental and 622 were of medical specialty and 522 (52.2%) articles underwent rejection. Among the rejected ones, dental specialty comprised of 43.5% and medical articles contributed 56.5 %.

The most frequent reasons for rejection were commonality (44.6%), non compliance by authors (17.8%), methodological issues (17.3%), plagiarism (11.1%), received same topic and published (7.66%), poor draft(6.70%), data inconsistency(5.77%), mismanagement(1.72%), blacklisted author(1.14%), ethical misconduct and out of scope were 0.57% each. Conclusion: This study found that the overall rejection rate of articles was around 52%. Most of the articles were rejected as the topics chosen were not innovative and were already much studied. Hence, the topic needs to be chosen well, methodology properly thought through, along with statistician consultation. Another important observation was that, most of the reasons for rejections after the first peer review report has been sent, can be avoided by improving inter author and author-journal communication.