

Analysis Identifies Top Reasons Manuscripts are Rejected by JAGS

A majority of the manuscripts that are submitted to but rejected by the *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society (JAGS)* aren't published because they're not novel or new studies; they lack a conceptual or theoretical framework; or are too narrowly focused, a new analysis of reviews of more than 200 rejected manuscripts finds.

The analysis, of reviews of 222 rejected manuscripts that were submitted to *JAGS* between January and April 2005, found the papers were rejected for an average of 2.5 reasons each. All told, the papers were rejected for more than 550 different reasons, but many papers were rejected at least in part for a handful of reasons that recurred frequently.

"These findings indicate the emphasis and priority placed by *JAGS* on publishing the most current and up-to-date information that is relevant in the field of aging and to our readership," said Thomas Yoshikawa, MD, Editor-in-Chief of *JAGS*. "The analysis also shows the high premium we place on the quality of the paper. The *Journal* will repeat the analysis for papers submitted in 2006 and 2007, respectively."

The reasons for rejection that were cited most frequently, in order, and the number and percentage of papers rejected for each reason are:

Rank	Reasons	No. (%)
1	Not a novel or new study; primarily confirmatory data	73 (13.2)
2	Lack of conceptual or theoretical framework or hypothesis	60 (10.8)
3	Too technical or narrowly focused; consider other journals	56 (10.1)
4	Incompletely described or inappropriate sampling method	43 (7.8)
5	Study design is inappropriate/flawed to answer study question	43 (7.8)
6	Not relevant nor of interest to our readership	35 (6.3)
7	Sample size is too small; underpowered study design	35 (6.3)
8	Inappropriate, incorrect or incomplete statistical methods	31 (5.6)
9	Tables or figures are difficult to read, interpret or inaccurate	30 (5.4)
10	Inappropriate, non-validated or poorly described instrument	28 (5.1)
11	Results over interpreted; conclusion doesn't follow results	21 (3.8)
12	Results are not generalizable to other populations	21 (3.8)
13	Data do not match or support text, abstract, tables, figures	17 (3.0)
14	Failure to follow style and format of <i>JAGS</i>	15 (2.7)
15	Poorly written; needs English editing	14 (2.5)
16	Incomplete, inadequate or outdated literature review	11 (2.0)
17	Others: Incomplete description of study population (9); title not representative of study (8); study population not elderly (3)	20 (3.5)