

JANUARY

2026 V 1.0

REJECTION RISK CHECK

REJECTION PREVENTION SAMPLE

Prepared by:

RESEARCHEDIT4U
SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD.
WHERE RESEARCH FIND WINGS



Rejection Risk Check

Editor-style Pre-Submission Report (Sample)

What you get in 3–5 days

- Pre-screen rejection flags (scope, structure, ethics, reporting).
- Peer-review style comments on methods, clarity, and claims.
- Action-ready improvement checklist + submission readiness notes.

This sample report demonstrates the depth of our Rejection Risk Check. It is designed to identify what editors and reviewers typically flag during initial screening and peer reviews so you can fix what matters first, before submission.

Integrity note: We do not create research data or claim authorship. All scientific claims and final decisions remain with the authors. Our role is advisory, editorial, and compliance-focused to improve readiness and reduce avoidable desk-reject triggers.

Contents

Rejection Risk Check.....	1
Top 5 Fix-First Items (highest impact)	3
2. Desk-Reject Flag Map (Scorecard)	4
3. Peer-Review Style Comments (Sample)	6
3.1 Major comments (must fix before submission)	6
3.2 Minor comments (clarity + formatting)	7
4. Action-Ready Improvement Checklist	8
Contact.....	9

1. Executive Verdict

Overall screening risk (current state): Medium → can be reduced to Low after fix-first actions below.

Top 5 Fix-First Items (highest impact)

- Clarify the scope-fit sentence in the Introduction and align the aim to the target journal's audience.
- Strengthen Methods transparency: sampling, measures, missing data handling, and assumptions.
- Reduce over-claiming: separate results from interpretation and add limitations that match the design.
- Add compliance statements: ethics approval/consent, funding/COI, data availability, reporting guideline.
- Improve figure/table readability: consistent rounding, complete legends, and clear variable definitions.

2. Desk-Reject Flag Map (Scorecard)

Risk area	Status	What editors screen	Fix-first proof to include
Scope fit	AMB ER	Does the paper clearly match aims & readership?	1–2 sentence scope-fit statement + 3 keywords aligned to journal.
Novelty framing	AMB ER	Is the contribution explicit and credible?	‘What this study adds’ paragraph + 2–3 supporting citations.
Methods clarity	RED	Replicable design, measures, analysis plan	Variable table + missing data note + model assumptions/diagnostics.
Ethics & disclosures	RED	Ethics approval, consent, COI, funding	Ethics ID + COI/funding + data availability + AI-use statement (if applicable).
Reporting guideline	AMB ER	STROBE/CONSORT/P RISMA alignment	Checklist attached + reporting items

<p>Figures/Tables</p>	<p>AMB ER</p>	<p>Legends, consistency, interpretability</p>	<p>completed in Methods/Results. Journal-style tables with clear labels and consistent rounding.</p>
<p>Language & structure</p>	<p>AMB ER</p>	<p>Logical flow, clarity, concision</p>	<p>Track-changes revision with ‘fix-first’ re-ordering of sections.</p>
<p>Similarity & integrity</p>	<p>GREE N</p>	<p>Originality + transparent declarations</p>	<p>Similarity scan guidance + transparent acknowledgements</p>

3. Peer-Review Style Comments (Sample)

Reviewer summary: The manuscript addresses an important question and is potentially publishable, but it requires major clarification of the methodological description and tighter alignment between claims and evidence. The narrative can be strengthened with clearer objectives, improved reporting transparency, and more disciplined interpretation.

3.1 Major comments (must fix before submission)

- Methods transparency is insufficient: specify sampling, inclusion criteria, measures, missing data handling, and analytic assumptions. Add a variable/measure table and model diagnostics.
- The Introduction needs a clearer ‘gap → aim → contribution’ chain. State the exact contribution in one paragraph (“what this adds”).
- Several claims in the Discussion over-generalize beyond the study design. Separate ‘finding’ from ‘interpretation’ and add realistic limitations.
- Ethics/disclosures must be explicit: ethics approval/consent, funding, conflict of interest, and data availability statement.

3.2 Minor comments (clarity + formatting)

- Define all abbreviations at first use and keep terminology consistent across sections.
- Standardize statistical reporting (e.g., β , SE, 95% CI, p) and use consistent decimal places.
- Improve table titles/legends so each can be understood without reading the main text.
- Remove redundant sentences in the Introduction; tighten to reduce screening fatigue.
- Ensure references follow a single style (APA/AMA) with consistent DOI formatting.

4. Action-Ready Improvement Checklist

Fix today (0–24 hours)

- Rewrite the aim in one sentence (what, who, where, why).
- Add a scope-fit statement aligned to target journal.
- Insert Ethics/COI/Funding/Data statements placeholders.

Fix this week (2–5 days)

- Add a Methods table (variables/measures) and specify missing data handling.
- Update Results with consistent reporting (effect sizes + confidence intervals).
- Rewrite Discussion to avoid over-claiming; add limitations that match design.
- Refine figures/tables to journal style.

Optional upgrades (for higher-impact targets)

- Strengthen theoretical framing and cite 2–3 recent high-quality studies.
- Add a sensitivity/robustness check and report it transparently.
- Improve the abstract with structured headings and clear contribution statement.

5. Submission Readiness Notes

Before submission, ensure these are prepared: (i) reporting checklist (STROBE/CONSORT/PRISMA as applicable), (ii) cover letter focused on contribution + fit, (iii) disclosures (ethics/COI/funding/data availability/AI-use), and (iv) final formatting per journal instructions.

No guarantees: acceptance is determined by journal editors and reviewers. Our objective is to reduce avoidable screening failures and improve clarity, rigor, and compliance.

Contact

- Share your draft + target journal(s) + deadline. We'll respond with a feasible fix-first plan.
- WhatsApp: +91-8093778526 | Email: support@researchedit4u.in

THANK YOU

YOU DON'T NEED A PERFECT MANUSCRIPT TO SUBMIT — YOU NEED AN EDITORS CHECKED-READY ONE.

**Next step: Share your draft + target journal + deadline.
We'll reply with a feasible plan and delivery timeline.**

**Integrity note: We support clarity, compliance, and
readiness. Final decisions remain with authors and
journals.**

 www.researchedit4u.in

 info@researchedit4u.in