


The Paper Rejection Repository

Nobody likes to receive a letter from the editor of your favorite journal letting you know that your paper was rejected. Some journals have begun including reviewers' comments with accepted papers to make the views of experts available to the reader. However, often the paper has been submitted to several journals and rejected before it is finally accepted. The rejection letters and comments are equally useful in helping to judge what kind of papers might be acceptable to a journal, and what kind of comments lead to rejections. Rather than hiding these low points in the trajectory of a scientific paper, this forum offers a place to publish these letters and comments to educate others.

If you would like to post your own rejection letters and comments, please log in (register on the page first), click on 'Upload rejection', fill in details requested on the form and attach a PDF containing all the material you would like to share. If you cannot answer the questions posed by the captcha on the registration page, please email **Nikolaus Grigorieff** for help.

Please remove any information that might be regarded as confidential and post only rejections of papers that were ultimately accepted by a journal.

For some background on this repository, please read our **blog post on F1000research.com**. The repository was also highlighted in posts on **Science Careers** and **The Scientist**.



Rejections

Posted On	Title	Rejected By	Ultimately Published In
22 Jul 2010	Near-atomic resolution using electron cryomicroscopy and single-particle reconstruction	Nature	2008, PNAS 105, 1867–1872 @
« first < previous 1 2 3			

Source URL: <http://grigoriefflab.janelia.org/rejections>