

Reasons for getting a quick rejection

Here are the most common reasons that papers are rejected without peer review. These papers may:

- Focus on a **narrow research question** that has limited theoretical and practical relevance and says little about personality as a whole, in the sense of either individual differences or within-individual systems.
- Focus on **correlations between the scores of self-report scales**, especially using cross-sectional data collected in a student sample; factor analysis, network analysis and structural equation models using such data are also likely to be rejected. Of course, not all papers reporting correlations between self-report scales are rejected. For example, studies also focusing on variables beyond self-reports, using unusual but sufficiently large samples, decomposing the variance in self-reports into meaningfully different components, and/or exploring moderators of the correlations may have a chance of being accepted.
- Focus on the development and validation of a measurement instrument
- Not include any **power analyses** or report any other well-articulated rationale for the sample size.
- Not have inferential statistics (p-values) adjusted for **multiple testing**, especially when many associations are being interpreted; for example, these papers may use the unadjusted p-value criterion of $p < .05$ throughout.
- Ignore the journal's **Open Science Policy**.
- Make explicit or implicit **causal inferences without a well-articulated rationale** for this (e.g., "This correlation shows that mindfulness makes people happy"); test mediation models that rely on hidden and unwarranted causal inferences.
- Over-claim the theoretical **importance of the findings**, especially if the effect sizes are small, the constructs are not thoroughly measured (e.g., using short scales with few experimental stimuli), methodological confounds (e.g., single-method biases) are likely, and the sample is not population-representative

Without a compelling and well-articulated rationale, claim that your findings have **practical implications** (e.g., for interventions), especially if the effect sizes are small and methodological confounds are likely.