INTERNET SOURCED EDITORIAL INVITATION WHEN FOLLOWED BY MANUSCRIPT REJECTION DISCOURAGES SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION UNLESS ADEQUATE EVALUATIONS ARE INCLUDED
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Abstract
The past few decades have witnessed renewal interest and research efforts on the part of the scientific community. Editors are increasingly writing prospective authors for contributions to knowledge. What happens after responding to such Internet guided invitations? In this paper, personal experiences are addressed to exemplify both positive and negative responses from the editors. It is recommended that encouraging scientific communication should be the aim and not capriciousness.

Keywords: Internet, editorial invitation, response, communication

Introduction
Communication is the bedrock of scientific advancement. As Eugene Garfield, the guru of scientific information, stated during his Magnus Pike Lecture, “English is the lingua franca of International Science.” Similarly, Huang appreciated that “English is the dominant medium of international academic journals.”

Journals of repute have enabled me, from far away Nigeria, West Africa, to contribute reviews and even a book published in Germany. In this context, the much respected Medical Hypotheses published my theory concerning using the transportation of lung cancer cells to obtain two subsets present in the microenvironment of the thoracic duct. One subset is necrotic cancer cells and the other is the lively cancer cells. Thereafter, invital videomicroscopy should lead to retrieval of them and lastly to replication of this combined natural phenomenon in translational centers. Hopefully, successful target therapy of this killer disease will become real.

Editorial Responses
Real published work mentioned above, I may add, had earlier suffered the fate of computerized invitation followed by rejection. Two examples should suffice. Firstly, on May 17, 2012, the first E-mail letter was from the Hindawi Publishing Company: “I am writing to invite you to submit an article to Lung Cancer International which provides a rapid forum, for the dissemination of original research articles as well as original review articles in all areas of lung cancer.”

The script was duly submitted and on June 7, 2012, came the reply, viz, “We regret to inform you that it was found unsuitable for publication.”

Manuscript rejection, in this context, involved two contrastable editorial practices. In the first type, editorial invitation was followed by blunt rejection without any reason. In contrast, in the second journal, there was reasoned rejection. Hence, it is hypothesized that, for the healthy growth of the literature, editorial performance should be geared towards cogent explanation for any rejection.

Conclusion
Rejection, in conclusion, should be recognized as a hurdle in communication. I am persuaded, with considerable writing experience, that no carte blanche rejection should be allowed. Indeed, the corteous consideration is for the Editor to indicate the area of choice. For instance, from the point of view of my publication experiences, there are my following dozen fields of cancer, e.g., parasitology, history, ophthalmology, epidemiology, information, animals, behavioral health, review, gynecology, ethnology, jurisprudence, and language. Clearly, any Editor inviting me to submit a paper could do so in...
such above fields. Or, any other expected field should be indicated but precisely as a matter of humaneness. Obviously, as was stated in this Journal, “the past few decades have witnessed renewed interest and research efforts on the part of the scientific community.” Accordingly, let that agreeably important arena of scientific publishing not suffer editorial caprices.
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