

Editorial: Why it may take a bit long for your manuscript to be sent out for review?

Journal of Economics and Development (JED) under the National Economics University is an international, peer-reviewed, Diamond Open Access journal published by Emerald Publishing. *JED* promotes theoretical and empirical research in economics, business and development, particularly studies relevant to developing and transitional economies and to global sustainability. The journal seeks manuscripts with new theoretical contributions, scientific novelty and methodological rigor that are of interest to an international readership.

Given *JED*'s current indexation and ranking (first quartile (Q1)) in all indexed disciplines, our editorial standards are increasingly demanding. Submission, thus, is only the beginning of a rigorous editorial screening process. Before a manuscript can be sent for double-blind peer review, it must pass an initial screening conducted by the editorial team and then by the journal's editors. If the manuscript fails any of the screening checkpoints, it will be desk-rejected. After that, the editors conduct a preliminary review to determine whether the manuscript can be sent out for review.

1. Editorial screening

1.1 Checkpoint 1: duplicate submission, prior publication or multiple submissions from the same author(s)

The first question is whether the manuscript is genuinely available for consideration. A paper must not be under review by another journal, nor may it have been published previously. Undeclared overlap with another publication, including an article in another language, may constitute duplicate publication. If the manuscript fails this check, it will be desk-rejected immediately.

It should be noted that multiple closely related manuscripts within a short period, particularly those that use the same dataset, variables and methods, may also raise critical concerns. The use of the same dataset is acceptable only when each paper addresses a distinct research question and makes an independent theoretical contribution. If the submissions merely divide or recycle one study without sufficient originality, they fail the initial screening. Emerald's ScholarOne system can help clarify this issue.

1.2 Checkpoint 2: plagiarism

Every submission is checked for plagiarism and textual similarity. Our editorial team examines where the overlap occurs, how extensive it is and whether sources have been properly acknowledged. If the manuscript fails this check, it will not pass the initial screening.

1.3 Checkpoint 3: tortured phrases and inappropriate use of generative AI

We also examine manuscripts for "tortured phrases": unnatural or misleading expressions apparently produced by mechanical paraphrasing, such as replacing established technical terms with bizarre synonyms (e.g. "climate fluctuation" instead of "climate change"). Such language may conceal copied material and can seriously distort scholarly meaning. In any case, artificial intelligence (AI) will not be considered an author. The authors must take full responsibility for the manuscript. If the manuscript fails this check, it will not pass the initial screening.



1.4 Checkpoint 4: reference integrity

Authors must ensure that every cited source exists, contains the information attributed to it and is presented with correct bibliographic details. Fabricated or AI-generated references, false digital object identifiers (DOIs) and misleading citations raise serious concerns about research integrity. If the references fail this check, the manuscript will not pass the initial screening. It should also be noted that even if the manuscript is sent out for review and later revised, any violations of this checkpoint would result in rejection. Accepted or published articles identified later with this issue may be retracted.

1.5 Checkpoint 5: compliance with JED and Emerald requirements

A submission must follow the journal's author guidelines, which are presented on our homepage. Poor formatting may appear minor but persistent non-compliance indicates that the manuscript is not ready for editorial consideration. If the manuscript fails this check, it will not pass the initial screening. Sometimes, we may unsubmit manuscripts that fail this check for revision and resubmission. This would result in a longer screening time. Authors are thus recommended to check the author guidelines carefully on the *JED* website and, in many cases, to read recently published articles in *JED* for reference.

2. With the editors: the final checkpoint before a manuscript can be sent out for review

When the submission passes all screening checkpoints, it goes to the editor-in-chief or the handling editors to decide whether to send it for review. It should be noted that not all submissions that pass the checkpoints- would be sent out for review. For *JED*'s current scope and objective, only manuscripts that have some potential to contribute to the relevant literature theoretically would be sent for review. Some critical points that authors should consider include are as follows:

- (1) Theoretical contributions mean something new or different from extant thinking in the relevant literature. Relevant theories here mean law-like relationships that have been theorized and tested in the relevant literature, as published in peer-reviewed journals on similar phenomena. Authors should then think about what law-like relationships would be discussed in their manuscript? What is new in your study, which has been clearly discussed in the manuscript, compared to the extant law-like relationships theorized and tested by previous research?
- (2) The novelty/originality section in the extended abstract is where authors should summarize the theoretical contributions. In many cases, we see authors restate the findings in this section instead. In many other cases, providing empirical evidence or policy implications/recommendations would not be considered theoretical contributions.
- (3) Since *JED* expects to review manuscripts with theoretical contributions, the authors' discussion of theoretical gaps in the literature review section is critical. Then, authors are expected to develop hypotheses with specific directions (e.g. positive, negative, stronger, weaker, linear or non-linear etc.). Hypotheses like "X would impact on Y" or "X is correlated with Y" are considered non-directional. It is important here to provide rigorous arguments for the direction of the hypothesis.

Manuscripts with potential theoretical contributions that meet other criteria set by *JED* (see [Nguyen, 2025](#)) would be sent out for review. Revised manuscripts, if allowed, can later be checked against the screening checkpoints above.

References

- Nguyen, H.V. (2025), "Editorial: why did I get desk rejected recently in *Journal of Economics and Development*?", *Journal of Economics and Development*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 2-3, doi: [10.1108/JED-03-2025-300](https://doi.org/10.1108/JED-03-2025-300).