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# Article summary:

1. Desk rejection is a common occurrence in the journal review process, where articles are rejected by editors before being sent to reviewers.

2. The reasons for desk rejection include failure to align with the journal's scope and quality, insufficient research contribution, and an increase in weaker submissions from certain countries.

3. Nine leading journal editors offer guidance on how to avoid desk rejection, including ensuring alignment with the journal's aims and scope, providing a clear research contribution, and following submission guidelines carefully.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

The article titled "Editorial: How to develop a quality research article and avoid a journal desk rejection" published on ScienceDirect provides insights from nine leading journal editors on how to avoid desk rejections. The article highlights the reasons for desk rejections, which include failure to align with the scope and relevance of the journal, insufficient research contribution, and poor quality papers. The article also discusses the challenges faced by editors in securing reviewers and the need to conserve their resources.

The article presents a one-sided view of the issue, focusing solely on the perspectives of journal editors. While their insights are valuable, it would have been beneficial to include input from authors who have experienced desk rejections. This would provide a more balanced perspective on the issue and offer practical advice for researchers.

The article lacks evidence to support some of its claims, such as an increase in submissions from countries like India, Brazil, and China leading to weaker papers entering the pipeline. Without data or statistics to back up this claim, it remains unsupported and potentially biased.

The article also fails to explore counterarguments or potential risks associated with following the guidance provided by editors. For example, some recommendations may lead authors to compromise their research integrity or overlook important aspects of their study in an attempt to align with journal requirements.

Additionally, while the article aims to provide guidance for authors on how to avoid desk rejections, it contains promotional content for ScienceDirect and Elsevier Ltd., which may undermine its credibility.

Overall, while the insights provided by journal editors are valuable, this article could benefit from a more balanced perspective that includes input from authors who have experienced desk rejections. Additionally, more evidence-based claims and consideration of potential risks associated with following editor guidance would enhance its credibility.

# Topics for further research:

* Author experiences with journal desk rejections
* Balanced perspective on journal desk rejections
* Risks of compromising research integrity for journal requirements
* Statistics on submissions from India
* Brazil
* and China to journals
* Alternatives to ScienceDirect and Elsevier Ltd. for publishing research
* Impact of desk rejections on early career researchers
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