

Factors influencing the acceptance of articles submitted for publication in the Journal of Business and Development Studies (JBDS)

Dr. Abdul Awal Khan^a, Md. Mahbubur Rahman

^a Professor, and Chief Advisor, Center for Research, Development, and Publications (CRDP), ISU

^b Associate professor, and Director, Center for Research, Development, and Publications (CRDP), ISU

ABSTRACT

This paper aimed at exploring the essential characteristics to be considered for selecting research manuscripts at the Journal of Business and Development Studies (JBDS). The authors reviewed relevant books, research articles as well as some expert reports to find out reasons for rejection and acceptance of the submitted manuscripts. Moreover, they scrutinized several books on research methods to identify all required criteria for accepting or rejecting submitted research manuscripts. The study attempted to find that the authors of selected articles clearly articulated their research questions, specific objectives and justified the relevance and significance of the study. This includes addressing gaps in the existing literature that the research aims to fill. A sound theoretical foundation is also a must, and thus the manuscripts are grounded in established theories or frameworks relevant to the research topic. As a matter of fact, theoretical perspectives are to guide the research design, analysis, and interpretation of findings. Methodological rigor is also a critical factor for acceptance. Manuscripts should employ appropriate research methods that are well-justified and aligned with the research objectives. Consistency in data collection, analysis, and interpretation is crucial. Submitted papers should clearly articulate the contributions of the research, and the manuscripts should be well-structured, with a coherent flow of ideas and findings presented logically.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: December 2023
1st Revision: February 2024
2nd Revision: April 2024
3rd Revision: June 2024
Accepted: July 2024
Online Published: Sep 2024

KEYWORDS

Qualitative research, quantitative research, methodological issues, JBDS, Bangladesh

1. Introduction

Every issue of this Journal, JBDS, features the submission of a large number of research articles from professionals, researchers, and academics belonging to various universities, as well as government and

non-governmental organizations around the nation. In fact, a significant portion of the entries cannot be published due to the massive volume of work involved and rigorous process of scrutiny involved (JBDS currently publishes approximately 40% of submissions). Finding out essential and thought-provoking ideas and discoveries of young scholars is one of our favorite mottos as editors. We frequently communicate with the authors during the initial stage of review and are tempted to share the amazing information and truths they unearth. The personnel involved in the process are editors, not writers. The question of "how much are they convinced?" emerges once the initial excitement of reading a new paper wears off. The goal of this paper is to help authors prepare pertinent, excellent submissions for JBDS, as they anticipate. Moreover, it will help editors to carefully analyze whether a manuscript should or should not be forwarded for peer review.

2. Selection of a Research Topic

Sometimes finding a study topic can be difficult, not because there are several topics worth looking into; rather the difficulty emerges from trying to formulate a problem statement that is both researchable and socio-economically relevant. It needs to be original and should not be just a copy of other people's work. Researchers need to think about the following main sources of inspiration (Sacred Heart University) to choose a topic to start with a research project:

- (i) Deductions from Theory:** A researcher can develop a research topic or hypothesis expressing the anticipated results, particularly empirical scenarios based on a theory. The study question to answer is "what relationship between variables will be observed if the theory aptly summarizes the state of affairs?" Afterwards, a methodical study can be planned and executed to determine whether the empirical evidence supports or refutes the hypothesis and, consequently, the theory.
- (ii) Identifying a Problem:** It serves as the foundation for a study and may be drawn from scholarly movements and works from fields outside the researcher's main field of study (Sharaf, 2022). Examining studies from similar fields might lead researchers to new directions for investigation and analysis. When choosing a study topic, an interdisciplinary approach presents the chance to develop a

more thorough grasp of a highly complicated problem than any discipline could.

- (iii) **Interviewing Practitioners:** Formal or informal conversations with practitioners who may offer insight into new possibilities for future study and how to make research findings increasingly relevant to practice can give birth to identifying research concerns about specific themes. Engaging in conversations with professionals — teachers, business owners, social workers, health care providers, etc.—offers the opportunity to pinpoint pragmatic issues that are often overlooked or understudied in academic circles (Rahman et al., 2022). Additionally, this may provide some useful information that could be used when planning and carrying out a study.
- (iv) **Personal Experience:** Daily encounters with subjects might provide interesting research insights that require to examine critically one's own encounters and/or annoyances with a problem that affects society, neighborhood, or community. This can be done, for instance, by making conscious observations of specific interactions for which there is no evident reason or by being present at an occurrence that may seem abnormal or damaging to a person or group.
- (v) **Reviewing Relevant Literature:** Choosing a research topic and problem can frequently be the result of a thorough analysis of relevant studies related to the researcher's general field of interest. This could highlight any area which still has not been fully understood. Research can be done to: (a) close these knowledge gaps, (b) assess whether the approaches used in earlier studies can be modified to address new issues, or (c) ascertain whether a study of a similar nature could be carried out in a different field or with a different study sample (i.e., different populations). In addition, it is common for writers to include implications for future research at the end of their findings which can serve as a useful source of issues to investigate (Rahman et al., 2023).

3. Problem Articulation and Finding Research Gaps

A research problem statement is a description of the issues to be studied with a view to help quick understanding of the readers in this regard. Its objective is to make the reader aware of the significance of the subject

under study. In order to point out that the research questions are in order to specify the parameters of the investigation, the author must situate the topic within a certain context.

The research challenge determines how a researcher must respond to the "what, why, and how" questions in the social sciences and business studies (Sharaf 2022). A research problem that passes the relevant criteria is referred to by the "what question". It is crucial that the researchers, in their response to the "what question", specify that they have not only read the information but have also considered its significance. A well-written statement, in order to withstand the "what question", should (i) be clear and precise (a well-written statement avoid making careless or sweeping generalizations), (ii) identifies the study's subject matter without using words or phrases that have strong emotional connotations, (iii) articulates the study's central question and essential variables or factors, (iv) specifies the key concepts and terms, (v) sets the study's boundaries and parameters, (vi) have some generalizability in terms of applicability and making the results into broader contexts, and (vii) communicates the study's significance, benefits, and rationale, regardless of the type of research.

4. Conceptual Framework and Theoretical Framework

A researcher must have a clear understanding of the concepts and theories related to the topic of study. Otherwise there remain chances of misconstruction. A concept is a thought or idea relevant to topic/subject. Whereas a theory is a set of concepts, models, and principles which can be derived from literature review, study of relevant theories and experience. Conceptual framework is an analytical structure relevant to context and variables. It illustrates the expected relationship between independent and dependent variables. It defines the relevant objectives for research process and management. On the other hand, a theoretical framework is the structure that holds out and supports a research work and maps the process to desired output. It encompasses not only the theory but also the narrative explanations as to research requirements and underlying assumptions.

Conceptual framework emerges from research questions that aid formulating and conceptualizing the structure for exploration. Theoretical framework is the outcome of the theory, modes and principles concerned which underpin the problem. In this connection it is

to be noted that conceptual and theoretical frameworks are not a must for all types of research. In descriptive research, conceptual framework may not be necessary and also in cases of descriptive and qualitative research theoretical framework is not a must. Use and application of these structures depend on the nature, type and scope of research.

However, both conceptual and theoretical framework act as a guide and blue print. A theory can inspire new or future study and provide a framework for prediction. High-quality research is rarely feasible without theory. In some qualitative as well as quantitative research, theory is crucial and applies to all phases of the research process. Its essence and benefits can be understood from the following discussion:

4.1 Theory as the base of research: In the research framework, theory is not avoidable. Even if it is accorded less weight, theory lends research a certain holiness and allure. In fact, theory is the beginning and the end of research and provides the sanctum sanctorum for all research, regardless of the subject matter, and aids in researchers' general comprehension of the concepts at play. Research without theory, so the saying goes, is like a human being without flesh—it's just a skeleton with bones. It is assured that theory enhances the beauty of investigation. It draws people in and helps them see the value and direction of research as well as its wholesomeness. A skeleton is just a structure made of bones; it can never be beautiful. In this regard, it is emphasized that theory guides the way for the admirable cognitive process of conception and conviction in study findings. The core of research is theory. The idea that the theory makes it easier to perceive the forest rather than just one tree, is also being emphasized by scholars. Theory always plays a crucial role in research, regardless of the area being studied.

4.2 Theory as a guide: As the center of study, theory directs investigators at every stage of the investigation. It guides the researcher through the entire research process, from formulating the problem to interpreting the data. It assists the investigators in all facets of the investigation. Theory is quite effective at explaining things. It provides context for the numerical data. The following paraphrasing illustrates the significance of theory: “The theory is a doorway into the world of study, and experience without theory is blind.” Without theory, there is nothing to learn. It serves as a basis for what and how to search for. Without theory, a researcher cannot proceed further. Theory serves as the basis and direction for study.

4.3 Theory leads to top-quality research: A researcher must start his/her investigation with the theory within the discipline concerned. The study of theory sets the framework for the investigation at every turn. While data and numerical numbers may be used in research, they are insufficient to meet all requirements. Research becomes more wholesome when a theoretical justification for such facts or numerical values are provided. So, theory cannot be disregarded in any aspect of study. This is being stressed because of the fact that in recent years, some academics have been using statistical software to give numerical data and statistics more weight without providing theoretical justification or interpretation for the data they used. Stated differently, the inclusion of theoretically explicated data lends aesthetic appeal to all forms of study.

4.4 Interrelationship between theory and research: Theory and research have intricate relationships with one another. Sound research necessitates a solid theoretical foundation. In order to interpret study findings, theory and research are mutually dependent. Hypotheses may be developed as a part of theories. In relevant cases research can be used to support or refute concerned theories. The study's conclusions bear more relevance and meaning when they are interpreted from the appropriate theoretical angle. It presents a phenomenon in a logical and methodical manner. The theory makes a sense of the empirical facts. Whereas data, facts, and conclusions function at the empirical or observation level, theories function at the conceptual level and are logical. When combined, they provide a stunning representation of the study or research.

5. Methodological Robustness

In adjudication of a research paper the initial focus points are the title and the research methodology. A researcher thus needs to carefully design an appropriate Research Methodology. Here it is to be noted that Research Methodology and Research Methods are two different terms. Research Methodology represents the overall journey starting from preparation stage and ends up with discussion and conclusion, whereas, Research Method deals with description of materials used, data collection and analysis i.e. only a part of the total journey. Some experts have no objection to use these two terms interchangeably but others stress on making distinctions. However, researchers are concerned only with 3As: Appropriateness, Adequacy and Adherence to set techniques

because, the Validity, Reliability and Reasonable accuracy depend on them.

Moreover, our specific concern with each submitted manuscript is methodological rigor. In actuality, academic researchers are content with how much has been accomplished as well as what has been accomplished. This is a result of our teamwork rather than a lack of trust between us. Regardless of methodological approach—qualitative, quantitative, or otherwise—the crisis of credible evidence persists. Overall, researchers maintain that using a range of proper inquiry approaches, such as quantitative, qualitative, and methodological possibilities (e.g., mixed methodologies, philosophical inquiry, historical methods, arts-based research, and so on), are essential to a modern educational research. In our review of manuscripts, we particularly encourage authors to be creative with their research approaches. The editorial board also care about the research's originality and significance, and want to know if a study is new and adds something valuable to the field—like fresh perspectives, uncommon settings, methods, or strategies. Our considerations encompass the ways in which the publication will advance theory, method, and practice, as well as the potential beneficiaries of the research.

5.1 Quantitative approach: Most of the papers submitted to JBDS are the results of quantitative research. Many of these are found to apply statistical analyses relevant to fieldwork-derived empirical data. Two methodological issues that we have encountered in these kinds of investigations need to be noted. The statistical processes in many cases are found either improperly explained or completely ignored, and it concerns rather fundamental research design features. However, in order for reviewers to evaluate the research design's validity, this information is essential. For example, a questionnaire is used to gather data, and the authors are required to consider the information about the participants, the method and timing of response collection, and the response rate. Furthermore, standard methods for reporting these results must be supplied when regression or ANOVA are used (Kim et al. 2023). Here, the authors might wish to refer to earlier works that used comparable statistical techniques and have been published in JBDS (or any other journal). We see this fundamental component as a prerequisite for article selection; in the absence of which we are unable to accept any work for peer review.

Next, the crisis of the problem regarding quantitative research is that, while many publications satisfy the first fundamental need, they frequently lack rigor. To put it plainly, methodological rigor and complex and sophisticated statistical analyses are not synonymous at JBDS. The strength of the assumptions upheld in any empirical investigation reduces the credibility of inference (i.e., interpretation and conclusion). The quality of the assumptions and the data are equally important in determining the quality of study conclusions (Pearl 2010). The quality of the assumptions—especially those that are critical to drawing a causal conclusion—is mostly empirically not testable, in contrast to the comparatively easy evaluation of the data quality, at least in theory. Therefore, in order to support the validity of his or her findings, a researcher must acknowledge and justify the plausibility of the assumptions made. Regardless of the intricacy of statistical methodologies, we commonly observe a lack of such attempts in many submissions to JBDS. Nonetheless, we anticipate that writers submitting quantitative research papers would clearly address whether or not their study's main assumptions are reasonable. Logic, literature reviews, or statistical methods like sensitivity analysis (e.g., Cinelli & Hazlett 2020) could all be used to this end.

5.2 Qualitative approach: Each volume at JBDS receives and publishes a good number of qualitative research. We assume qualitative research as empirical investigations that make use of inductive theorizing and narrative forms of data, such as participant observation, interviews, field notes, and document analysis. Our main criteria for evaluating such articles are coherence in the study issues, chosen methodologies, conclusions, and theoretical analysis. Receiving submissions devoid of issue statements or research questions is another frequent occurrence. In many situations, it is difficult to determine whether the right techniques were applied or whether the desired results were obtained because we are unaware of the study's total journey. However, we observed that a large number of submitted articles misalign interpretive methodologies with positivist logic, rendering this kind of study illogical. So, we emphasize that the goals, selected techniques, and theoretical frameworks must align with the assumptions of the qualitative research.

We examine more closely the prerequisites in order to establish a reasonable standard for overseeing and assessing quality. In particular, we stress validity, reliability, and generality as the fundamental components that guarantee the caliber of qualitative research (Saldaña &

Omasta, 2018). Based on the experience and viewpoint of research participants, we assess the degree to which the study accurately depicts the phenomenon of interest in order to determine its credibility. We consider the application of theories, data sources, and methodologies to produce thorough understandings of the study phenomena.

To create engaging in cohesive findings, researchers in qualitative research alternate between several components of the study (such as problem formulation, literature review, and data gathering techniques). Furthermore, one of the most popular methods for determining the validity of qualitative research is member checking. In a baseline study, we assess the member checking procedure, which aids in determining the fairness and accuracy of the constructed interpretation as well as clearing up any ambiguity. When determining whether a study is generalizable, we place special emphasis on how study findings are applied to other situations and contribute to the formation of theories.

5.3 Validity, reliability, and generalizability: Additionally, since the volume of data gathered is not a factor in qualitative research, the editorial committee do consider the quality of the data—such as its authenticity and dependability—as well as its applicability in addressing the research questions of the study (Jarrahi and Newlands 2024). Moreover, the editorial board examine whether the common requirements and methodological rigor techniques—such as extended engagement, triangulation, thick description, audit trails, reflexivity, and member verification, among others—have been met (in qualitative research). Further, we consider the theory that has been utilized to interpret the results. Although theory is not always used in qualitative research, it frequently improves how the data are interpreted. Therefore, we believe that the proper application of theory, relevant models or standards as available be used in qualitative research which would greatly improve the dependability of the results. Lastly, we consider the qualitative study's potential value to the larger academic community. This refers to the potential transferability of findings to other relevant contexts or circumstances, but it does not imply generalizability in the quantitative sense. To be clear, the suggestions made here do not constitute a rigid framework by which we judge research, but they do contribute to our understanding of the cognitive domain.

5.4 Mixed research approach: The methods of data used (textual or numeric; structured or unstructured); the logic applied (inductive or deductive); the type of investigation (exploratory or confirmatory); the method of analysis (interpretive or statistical); the approach to explanation (variance theory or process theory); and, for some, the presumptive underlying paradigm (positivist or interpretive/critical; rationalistic or naturalistic) have all been used to distinguish (and thereby define) qualitative and quantitative approaches. In particular, the editors give a look at whether the researcher makes apparent the rationale and design behind selecting a mixed methods design (Greene et al. 1989), the absence of which could potentially cause misunderstanding throughout the study's design phase. Given that they fail to acknowledge the complete contribution of each approach, several researchers might not even be deemed to have used mixed methods (Patton, 1988). Mixed approaches may be required for purposes of commencement, expansion, or confirmation (Rossman & Wilson, 1985). Unlike the simpler component designs usually employed for expansion or corroboration or initiation, in the form of an interactive, nested, holistic, or transformative design (Caracelli and Greene 1997), demands an integration of methodologies.

5.5 Sampling procedure: While qualitative studies are typically linked to smaller, purposeful (non-random) samples, quantitative research is typically expected to rely on large, randomly generated samples. Nevertheless, fine hermeneutic analysis cannot be performed on data from large random samples, and there are no statistics available for generalizing from small purposeful samples. Larger samples can be used to find cases for in-depth research (see Nickel, Berger, Schmidt & Plies 1995, for example), and computerization can make it easier to test the generalizability of concepts developed through in-depth interpretive analysis of a subset of those texts across a wider range of texts (Bazeley, 2002). As qualitative analysis becomes more and more computerized and people trained in quantitative research methods use qualitative analysis software, there is a tendency for researchers to try to incorporate much larger volume of unstructured data than have historically been used in qualitative methods. The editorial board suggest that purposive sampling can satisfy expectations regarding the statistical generalization of results; nevertheless, improper application of one method's criteria distorts

and may even invalidate the assumptions of another. A two-tier base sample can also be used in feasible field to minimize the question.

5.6 Issues for statistical analysis: Error rates in derived estimates of population characteristics are related to sample size, and inferential statistics are predicated on the assumption of a random or representative selection of cases. Therefore, the kind of statistical approaches that can be employed effectively and the ability to generalize it to a larger population are limited by sample selection and sample sizes. Every statistical technique has specific presumptions that must be satisfied in order to apply it appropriately. Most measures (including scaled measures) for data produced from qualitative coding will be nominal or ordinal rather than interval, distributions may not be known, and normality cannot be presumed. Means are probably not as suitable for descriptive reporting as medians. Multicollinearity can arise when there is a lack of independence in observations for specific categories of data (Roberts, 2000). Similarly, categories on the same axis are assumed to be mutually exclusive when using chi-square analysis. While exploratory multivariate techniques, like cluster and correspondence analysis, can generally be applied to quantified data where conditions of normality and randomness are not necessarily met, classic multivariate methods, which are based on the general linear model, have strict assumptions. However, even these techniques are inappropriate if all variables are not equally relevant to all cases (Prein & Kucharz 1995). Variations and exceptions are handled differently by various data analysis techniques. When dealing with variation in the sample, statisticians frequently just eliminate "outliers" from their analysis and depend on probability estimates. Variation is "error" when describing the "typical" as the aim. Using a qualitative technique, the researcher adjusts theory to accommodate for exceptions and uses variation to shed light on evolving theories (Barbour, 1998; Miles & Huberman 1994).

6. Writing up

Writing is an art. It must be simple and be persuasive, clear and understandable. Here it is to be remembered that in writing, using either a qualitative analysis or a mixed method is similar in that they rarely adhere to a set structure. The question of how much quantitative and qualitative data can or should be incorporated arises when deciding how

best to communicate the concepts and supporting data from the completed study. The degree to which they were integrated throughout the study may have an impact, but it is not the only factor. Too frequently, the findings and conclusions from one sort of data or analysis are first offered, followed by the findings and conclusions from the other, and then, if at all, no attempt is made to combine them into a single, comprehensive conclusion. Even when used consecutively or side by side, if the various approaches are intended to work together to create a shared understanding, the art of separating the various elements when reporting and interpreting the findings is likely to result in a report that is fragmented and possibly repetitive. It is therefore, preferable to gradually present pertinent data while working toward a consensus rather than structuring groups according to the methodology.

7. The Essence of Being Well-structured

In addition to being well-written, the quality research paper has also to ensure excellent editing, formatting, and proofreading. Make sure the content of your work is strong and devoid of typos, grammatical problems, and formatting flaws, whether it's a research piece or review paper. The reader will readily grasp your concepts if your research paper is coherent, clear, and error-free. For this reason, we place a strong emphasis on meticulous editing and revising research submissions before they are published in the JBDS. Additionally, we pay close attention to the way the abstract and title have been written. These are the most crucial sections of a research paper, and they must be enjoyable to read. The "title" ought to be clear, succinct, exact, interesting, relevant, accurate, direct, and non-misleading.

8. The Rigorous Review Process for Manuscript Acceptance

The study adhered to a rigorous process for evaluating manuscripts, determining their acceptance or rejection in the various issues of the journal. A rigorous review process for manuscript acceptance typically involves several key stages designed to ensure the quality and integrity of published research. These are: initial submission review, assessment to an editor, selection of reviewers, blind peer review, novelty and

originality, methodology, results and interpretation, clarity and structure, references and Citations. Additionally, the study revealed that reviewers' feedback, the revision process, and the final decision all played crucial roles in determining whether a paper would be published in the journal. The following table has been developed to assess the various stages of the decision-making process that manuscripts undergo.

Table: 01 Scrutinize process of submitted articles

Journal Volume	No of total submission	Accepted without any modifications	Outright rejection	Accepted after 1 st modification	Accepted after 2 nd review	Accepted after 3 rd review	Accepted after 4 th review	% of Acceptance
Vol: 1	20	0	11	2	3	3	1	40%
Vol: 2	21	0	12	0	4	3	2	30%
Vol: 3	20	0	10	0	2	4	4	50%
Total	61	0	34	2	9	10	6	40%

(Source: review of submitted manuscripts, 2024)

Table 1 shows that 40% of the manuscripts were accepted for publication in the first volume of the journal. In this volume, 11 manuscripts were rejected after the initial screening, while 2 were accepted after the first review. One paper was accepted after the fourth reviews, and 3 papers were accepted after the second and third reviews, respectively. In the second volume, 30% of the manuscripts were accepted for publication. Of these, 12 manuscripts were rejected after the initial screening, 4 were accepted after both the second and the third reviews, and only two manuscripts were accepted after the fourth review. Notably, none of the manuscripts were accepted after the first review. In the third volume, 50% of the manuscripts were accepted for publication, the highest rate compared to the first and the second volumes. In this volume, 10 manuscripts were rejected after the initial screening. Of the remaining manuscripts, 2 were accepted after the second review, 4 after the third review, and 4 after the fourth review. Like previous volumes, none of the manuscripts were accepted after the first review.

Table: 02 Reasons of rejecting manuscripts

Reason	Level of concern	Analysis of reasons											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
1	Low	Not relevant to the journal's scope	Insufficient data	Methodology issues	Clarity of writing	Language errors	Formatting problems	Missing references	Plagiarism	Unethical practices	Other	Other	Other
2	Medium	Not relevant to the journal's scope	Insufficient data	Methodology issues	Clarity of writing	Language errors	Formatting problems	Missing references	Plagiarism	Unethical practices	Other	Other	Other
3	High	Not relevant to the journal's scope	Insufficient data	Methodology issues	Clarity of writing	Language errors	Formatting problems	Missing references	Plagiarism	Unethical practices	Other	Other	Other

(Source: review of submitted manuscripts, 2024)

9. Reasons for Rejecting the Manuscripts for Publication

The editorial board of the JBDS identified several key reasons for rejecting manuscripts based on their reviewed submissions. Here's a breakdown of the issues the board found:

(a) Lack of clarity in research overview and objectives:

- Some manuscripts failed to provide a clear overview of the research topic.
- A few did not adequately justify the study or discuss the research gaps.
- Objectives of the study were not clearly stated.

(b) Poor theoretical framework and methodological issues:

- Theoretical frameworks in some papers were deemed inadequate or absent.
- Lack of support from established theories was noted.
- Suggestions were made for longitudinal studies when developing models.
- Inconsistencies in data analysis methods were observed, such as the absence of factor analysis despite using a self-administered questionnaire.

(c) Lack of relevance to existing literature:

- Several rejected papers did not discuss relevant findings from previously published research in the discussion section.

(d) Contributions and future study guidelines not mentioned:

- Some manuscripts did not clearly articulate the contributions of the research.
- Guidelines for future studies were either not mentioned or insufficient.

(e) Weak findings and analysis:

- Findings and analysis did not effectively align with the study's main objectives.
- Causal relationships between explored factors and data were not clearly structured or matched.

(f) Language weakness:

- Most rejections were due to improper language.

Additionally, the following reasons have been mentioned below.

- (i) The manuscript does not offer new insights or contributions to the field and may be too similar to existing work.
- (ii) Flaws in the study's methodology, such as poor experimental design, inadequate controls, or flawed statistical analysis.
- (iii) The subject matter is not relevant to the journal's focus or scope, making it unsuitable for the publication.
- (iv) The manuscript does not adhere to the submission guidelines or formatting requirements set by the journal.
- (v) Issues related to research ethics, such as inadequate consent, misuse of data, or unethical practices.
- (vi) The manuscript is too similar to previously published work, failing to offer new perspectives or advancements.
- (vii) Incorrect or misleading references that undermine the credibility of the research.
- (viii) The manuscript's abstract or introduction fails to clearly present the research question, significance, or objectives.
- (ix) The manuscript's content or style does not align with the journal's specific audience, mission, or thematic focus.

Based on these observations, the editorial board expects future submissions to clearly articulate the rationale, objectives, and contributions of the research in lucid language. They also value robust methodology, including appropriate use of theoretical frameworks and consistent, rigorous data analysis methods. Addressing these points in future submissions may result in higher rate of acceptance.

10. Peer Review Process

The editorial board adheres to the highest standards of transparency in the peer review process, which is a cornerstone of our publication. The peer review process in the published journal, including the criteria utilized, the reviewers' selection procedure, the type of review, deadlines, and the editorial board's handling of it is fully disclosed in the published journal. The editorial board provides insightful information about a journal's caliber. The board members have a reputation as subject-matter experts, are connected to reputable organizations, and possess the necessary academic qualifications. The website also provides the editorial staff's contact details. It is advised to conduct further research before processing a paper for peer review if any information is missing

or there is no way to contact the editorial board members. Journal editorial board write insightful editorials that examine changes to the journal's regulations for writers, if any, or offer background information or relevance to publications related to a certain problem.

11. Conflict of Interest

The journal website provides further information on how conflicts of interest are managed, and anonymity is maintained along with other ethical guidelines for peer reviewers (JBDS, 2022). The journal website also covers informed consent, permission of internal review board, plagiarism, conflicts of interest, confidentiality, and other ethical issues. Another sign of a high-quality publication is its author rights and copyright policy, which is readily available on the JBDS website. A collection of rights known as copyright allows authors to use, share, exhibit, and alter their creations in any format. Additionally, we are dedicated to getting our journal listed in citations and bibliographic databases like MEDLINE and Scopus.

12. Conclusion

We hope that this editorial guideline will be helpful to authors who are thinking about publishing with JBDS. We have tried to clarify the standards that editors consider when processing submissions for further assessment. Our ultimate goal is for every manuscript that has to be published in the JBDS to ensure for high quality and significance to its readers.

References

- Bazeley, P. (2002). Computerized data analysis for mixed methods research. in A. Tashakorri, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods for the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 385-422.
- Caracelli, V. J., & Greene, J. C. (1997). Crafting mixed-method evaluation designs. In J. C. Greene, & V. J. Caracelli (Eds), *Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms* (pp. 19-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chen, H. (1997). Applying mixed methods under the framework of theory-driven evaluations. In J. C. Greene, & V. J. Caracelli (Eds), *Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of*

- integrating diverse paradigms (pp. 61-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Cinelli, C., & Hazlett, C. (2020). Making sense of sensitivity: Extending omitted variable bias. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 82(1), 39–67.
- D. M. Fetterman (ed.). (1989). *Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education: the silent scientific revolution* (pp. 116-137). N.Y.: Praeger.
- Patton, M. Q. (1989). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fielding, N. G., & Fielding, J. L. (1986). *Linking data: The articulation of qualitative and quantitative methods in social research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255-274.
- Greene, J. C., & Caracelli, V. J. (1997). Defining and describing the paradigm issues in mixed-method evaluation. In J. C. Greene, & V. J. Caracelli (Eds), *Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms* (pp. 5-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jarrahi, M. H., & Newlands, G. (1980). *Quality in qualitative research: Through the lens of validity, reliability and generalizability*.
- Kim, Y., Kester, K. & Han, S. (2022). Interesting, but are we convinced? The importance of methodological rigor at Asia Pacific Education Review. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* **23**, 209–210 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09768-3>
- Morgan, D. L. (Ed.) (1993). *Successful focus groups*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Morgan, D. L. (1998). Practical strategies for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: Applications to health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8(3), 362-376.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40, 120-123.
- Nickel, B., Berger, M., Schmidt, P., & Plies, K. (1995). Qualitative sampling in a multi-method survey. *Quality and Quantity*, 29, 223-240.
- Patton, M. Q. (1988). Paradigms and pragmatism. in
- Patton, M. Q. (1988). Paradigms and pragmatism. in D. M. Fetterman (ed.), *Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education: the silent scientific revolution* (pp. 116-137). N.Y.: Praeger.
- Patton, M. Q. (1989). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Pearl, J. (2010). The foundations of causal inference. *Sociological Methodology*, 40(1), 75–149
- Rossmann, G. B., & Wilson, B. L. (1985). Numbers and words: Combining quantitative and qualitative methods in a single large-scale evaluation study. *Evaluation Review*, 9(5), 627-643.
- Roberts, C. W. (2000). A conceptual framework for quantitative text analysis. *Quality and Quantity*, 34, 259-274.
- Rahman, M. M; Abdullah, A. B. M.; and Murad, W., (2018). Community Perceptions of and Vulnerability to Earthquake Disaster: Insights from the City of Dhaka, Bangladesh, *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management (JEAPM)*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., vol. 20(04), pages 1-27, DOI:10.1142/S1464333218500138
- Rahman, M. M. (2012). Natural Hazard and Human induced Hazard: A Discourse of Disaster and Social Vulnerability Analysis. *Journal of Bangla Vision*, 1–19.
- Rahman, M. M., & Husain, T. (2022). Structural barriers to providing basic education to Rohingya children in the Kutupalong refugee camp, Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 3, 100159.
- Rahman, M.M., Shindaini, A.J.M. & Abdullah, A.B.M. (2023). Provision of education to Rohingya refugee children in Bangladesh: exploring the forms of discrimination and intersectionality. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* 24, 433–445 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-022-09770-9>
- Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. Sage.
- Saraf, A. E., (2022). The Research Gap (Literature Gap): Everything you need to know to find a quality research gap, link: <https://gradcoach.com/research-gap/>

Weblinks:

Sacred Heart University/Library: <https://library.sacredheart.edu/c.php?g=29803&p=185918>

HCFAI University: <http://journal.iujharkhand.edu.in/june-2022/6-Role-of-Theory-In-Research.html>

<https://www.researchomatic.com/the-importance-of-theory-in-research-196282.html><https://research-methodology.net/theory/>

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/201834276_The_Role_of_The_ory_in_Research

<https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/theoreticalframework>

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1058505.pdf>.

Declaration of Interests

We, the authors of this research manuscript, declare that we have no financial interest. We have provided written consent to publish the paper in this journal.

To cite this article: Khan, A. A., and Rahman M M., (2024). Factors influencing the acceptance of articles submitted for publication in the Journal of Business and Development Studies (JBDS). *Journal of Business and Development Studies*, Vol: 02, Issue: 02, page: 1:19, ISUCRDP, Dhaka