

Common Reasons for Scientific Output Failing to Pass the Review Process in Promotion Applications

The table below outlines the most common reasons why some research papers receive low evaluation scores from reviewers when assessing applications for academic promotion. Consequently, these deficiencies may lead to the rejection of promotion requests. This list was compiled based on comments and observations submitted by several academic reviewers to the Scientific Council. Its purpose is to raise awareness among faculty members, ensure the quality of their scholarly output, and expedite the promotion process.

Type	Main Reason	Examples / Reviewer Comments
Research Content	Lack or weakness of scientific contribution	The paper is repetitive, presents no new knowledge, or offers shallow and limited findings.
Research Methodology	Limited tools or samples that do not represent the research population	Small sample size or unjustified data analysis.
	Absence of validity and reliability verification in field studies	
	Weak statistical, linguistic, or descriptive analysis	
Results	Inconsistency between results and research questions	Weak linkage between hypotheses and findings.
Discussion and Analysis	Inadequate connection between results, literature, and study objectives	- Merely listing results without connecting them to previous studies or the theoretical framework. - Overinterpretation of results or drawing conclusions not supported by data.
	Incorrect or confusing statistical tables	
Language and Scholarly Editing	Linguistic or stylistic errors; non-academic writing style	They negatively impact the reviewer's impression.
Journal Selection	Publishing in predatory or deceptive journals	Such journals often lack rigorous peer review, creating a negative impression about the applicant's research record.
Documentation and References	Use of outdated, inaccurate, or scientifically unacceptable sources	- Citing references older than ten years in rapidly developing fields. - Reliance on non-refereed or secondary sources. - Including sources in the reference list not cited in the text, or vice versa. - Inconsistent citation styles (e.g., APA in text and MLA in references). - Missing essential details such as volume, issue, page numbers, or DOI. - Misuse of artificial intelligence tools and/or failure to properly document their use.
	Errors in citation styles (APA, MLA, Chicago...)	
	Excessive reliance on online or secondary references	
Self-Plagiarism	Partial or complete similarity with previous works by the same author	Reuse of data, text, or figures from earlier studies.
Authorship and Researcher Role	Unclear or inaccurate contribution of the researcher	- Researcher had no real role. - Several co-authors sharing a minimal task. - Claimed contribution inconsistent with actual accessibility (e.g., data collected from a site the researcher could not access).
Specialization	Certain submitted papers are not aligned with the candidate's area of specialization	This leads to the exclusion of the paper from consideration, thereby preventing the applicant from meeting the required publication points for promotion.
Plagiarism	Borrowing material from other sources without proper citation	Plagiarism or scientific misconduct detected in the submitted research.
Structure of the Research Paper	Missing or inadequately developed sections	Absence or superficial coverage of essential components such as introduction, literature review, problem statement, methodology, or results analysis.