

CTRJ Review Decision Categories

Desk Reject

“Desk Reject” is often initiated by the editor. The appropriate associate editor (AE) may be contacted for their evaluation. A desk reject may also be initiated by the AE, who then contacts the editor. The purpose of a desk reject is to avoid sending manuscripts that are poorly written, inadequately conceptualized, have poor methods, and so forth to reviewers.

The types of issues that fit the “Desk Reject” decision include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Topic – Topic is not useful to or does not fit the readership of *CTRJ*.
- Overlap with the literature – There is replication from the literature. *CTRJ* manuscripts should contain new research information unless they are literature reviews. Literature reviews published in *CTRJ* should contain information not previously available as a literature review or information in need of updating.
- Lack of scientific rigor – Scientific rigor is not demonstrated in the literature review, the logic of the conceptual/theoretical component, and the method, results, and discussion.
- Communication – The quality and clarity of the writing is so poor that it does not meet the standard expected by *CTRJ* and also it is not possible to determine the purpose and the details of the method, results, and conclusion.
- Other -- Critical manuscript components are missing or inadequate in depth. Authors’ names and institutions were included in the paper. The key submission guidelines were not followed such as no continuous line numbers and no consistency in reference style.

Reject

The types of issues identified by the reviewer(s) that fit the “Reject” decision include, but are not limited to, the following (Note: The Reject decision occurs when several of the issues or a large majority of the issues identified below are found in the manuscript. If only one or a few of these issues occur and can be corrected, the decision should be major revision):

- The study is overly simplistic (i.e., topic has not been fully developed)
- The discussion and development of the theoretical framework shows logical errors and major flaws.
- There are major issues in terms of the integration of theoretical reasoning with the development of the hypotheses.
- The method(s) and logic are flawed or largely inadequate (mostly likely requiring a new set of data or new analysis).
- Substantive components of the method are missing or not discussed.
- The hypotheses need to be largely re-worked or have no literature support and thus data collection or data analysis may no longer be appropriate.
- There are major sampling errors that negatively impact the results and the conclusions.
- There are major conceptual flaws and inconsistent arguments.
- The purpose of study lacks depth; there is a need to rethink and collect additional or different data.
- The data analysis is incorrect or there is inadequate information on the data analysis process.

- The purpose of study does not bring merit or new insights, is repetitive of the literature already in print, not important, and so forth.
- There are major issues with each section of the manuscript.
- In the case of a revised manuscript, many issues were not addressed and a fatal flaw developed as a result of the revision.

Risky Revision

Occasionally, the editor or AE may feel that the manuscript is in a borderline situation between reject and major revision, yet is unsure of what the quality of the next revision would look like. In that case, the editor could make a “Risky Revision” decision. This requires more extensive revision than regular major revisions and the possibility of moving forward in the review process is lower than the manuscripts under regular major revisions. Furthermore, without having substantial changes in the revision, further reviews cannot be promised. Risky Revision is used only by the editor and it is not listed as one of the decision options for associate editor and reviewers.

The types of issues leading to “Risky Revision” include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The manuscript is clearly in need of a substantial revision, although the purpose of the manuscript is novel and of interest and value to the *CTRJ* readership.
- The steps needed to improve the quality of the work are not clear or are not known.
- New data, new analysis or new theorizing will be needed, but uncertainty and risk are present in the revision process.
- There are multiple substantive problems, and it is likely that if the author(s) revises, additional major problems may appear as a result of the revision.

Major Revision

Selecting “Major Revision” means that the topic is believed to be appropriate for *CTRJ* but there are major concerns with the manuscript that can be corrected to enable acceptance.

The types of issues leading to “Major Revision” include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Writing statements such as “X was chosen because of A and B” but then not providing any literature and/or research support for A and B
- The manuscript has statements/arguments that are not logical, convincing, or for which the author(s) have not provided adequate justification.
- Information in the manuscript contradicts existing knowledge and the author(s) have not provided arguments/findings to support these contradictory views.
- The manuscript contains methodological flaws such as the following examples:
 - Triangulation was used but the authors do not discuss what they mean by triangulation or what specific methods were used.
 - In qualitative data collection, there is no discussion of how themes were reviewed and validated. Author(s) do not state when themes were established or emerged, whether it was before data collection or during analysis.
 - The discussion is inadequate for all or part of the methods section.
- When previously developed theories are presented, there is no integration of the theories, or no theoretical/conceptual frameworks are discussed in the literature review, in the hypothesis development, or with the data analysis and results.

- There is a lack of any type of theoretical or conceptual framework or model, whether a starting framework or developed by the author(s).
- In studies in which qualitative data are collected, sometimes the authors do not start with existing theories because part of the purpose of the study is to develop a theory or to explore that as a possibility. Thus, the lack of a theory is not necessarily a negative. However, the development of a theory needs to be discussed.
- Authors make generalizations beyond what is justified by their research methods or results.

Minor Revision

“Minor Revision” is selected when the manuscript is viewed as having a high potential for publication in CTRJ, but small changes are needed for clarification and to strengthen the manuscript.

The types of changes that fit “Minor Revision” include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The review of literature should be strengthened or clarified, for example, by including key references which have not been discussed.
- Purpose, research questions, or hypotheses should be revised for clarification.
Note: If research questions and hypotheses do not match the other sections of the manuscript, then the decision would be a major revision (if the second review) or reject (if the third review).
- Research procedure should be clarified (i.e., method/procedure is not wrong but is not explained clearly or with depth).
Note: Sometimes the introduction of new content in the methods section with the second or third manuscript reveals fatal flaws. If this is the case, the revised manuscript should be given a second major revision if this is the first revision but should be rejected after two major revisions.
- Results should be strengthened or clarified.
- Implications/Limitations/Conclusion should be revised to better reflect the findings.

Accept with Editorial Changes

“Accept with Editorial Changes” is selected if the manuscript is ready for publication. Most of the writing is at a high scholarly level with no questions about content, method, results, etc., but there are a few writing changes needed (i.e., a few sentence structure changes, spelling, APA style, etc.).

The types of changes that are to be made for an “Accept with Editorial Changes” decision include, but are not limited to, the following:

- There are a few awkward phrases/sentences.
- There are a few grammatical/spelling errors.
- There is a need to clarify the meaning in a few places.
- A heading needs to be made more concise.
- A small number of references have errors.
- APA style is not used for references, tables, figures, and headings/subheadings.
- A few citations are not listed in the reference list.

Accept

Choosing “Accept” as the review decision means that the manuscript is believed to be ready for publication. This choice means NO changes are needed; this includes no editorial changes.