

EDITORS' NOTE

STREAMLINING THE REVISE AND RESUBMIT PROCESS AT *AMJ*

During each annual Academy of Management meeting, *AMJ*'s editorial team participates in a large number of sessions designed to inform people about the publication process and to answer questions that are on people's minds. In addition, *AMJ*'s full editorial board meets to review events of the past 12 months and to plan for the future.

One of the topics that surfaced during several of this year's sessions was the increasing challenge that authors face in responding to the revision and resubmission (R&R) process, not just at *AMJ* but at other journals as well. Although authors are generally pleased to receive an invitation to revise their manuscripts, the task of responding not only to the editor's letter, but also to reviewers' individual comments, can be quite daunting. Indeed, it sometimes takes authors as long to write the letter accompanying the revised manuscript as it does to revise the manuscript itself (e.g., Agarwal, Echambadi, Franco, & Sarkar, 2006). Equally troubling is the concern that in trying to be highly responsive to all reviewer comments, authors sometimes end up with a more disjointed, less compelling manuscript than they would have if they were encouraged to describe their revisions in a more holistic, big picture fashion.

After discussing this issue at *AMJ*'s board meeting, the editors and board members have decided to streamline the process of responding to editorial and reviewer comments following receipt of an invitation to revise and resubmit one's work to *AMJ*. Although we will still expect authors to consider all reviewer comments in the process of *revising* their manuscripts, we will no longer ask that they explicitly respond to each individual reviewer comment in their resubmission transmittal letters. Rather, we will urge authors to spend the bulk of their time improving the manuscript itself, rather than summarizing all the point-by-point changes they have made in response to each and every reviewer comment.

To implement these changes, the action editor's instructions to resubmitting authors have been changed as follows (specifics may vary according to the particular case):

As you revise your manuscript, please consider each reviewer comment carefully, since even relatively minor comments can sometimes trigger large improvements in a manuscript. However, once the revision has been completed, please focus your transmittal letter mainly on the issues raised in my letter rather than on the specific points raised by each reviewer. Our intent is to have you spend most of your time improving your manuscript rather than documenting in great detail all specific changes that have been made. To that end, please indicate (in approximately 5–7 pages) how you have responded to the points raised in my letter. Because my letter synthesizes both the reviewers' and my own major concerns, addressing these points will generally ensure that the major issues have been addressed. However, if you decide *not* to make a substantive change suggested by a reviewer, you will probably find it in your best interest to explain your rationale, even if that particular point was not mentioned in my decision letter. Other than this exception, specific responses to individual reviewer comments will not be expected.

These changes have implications for *reviewers* as well as for authors. First, it is very important that reviewers communicate to the editor and author(s) which issues are, in their view, most crucial to a successful revision. In this way, divergent views can be noted and explicitly discussed in the action editor's letter. Second, once a manuscript has been resubmitted, reviewers should focus on the *overall quality of the revised paper* in light of the changes made, rather than on the responses to individual reviewer comments (which will no longer be requested).

By implementing these changes, we hope to enable authors to focus more on improving their papers and less on reporting the details of the revision process per se. After all, *AMJ* readers only see the

published paper, and not all the behind-the-scenes work that led to it. We hope that this change in procedures will not only streamline the R&R process for authors, editors, and reviewers, but also result in better papers.

REFERENCE

- Agarwal, R., Echambadi, R., Franco, A., & Sarkar, MB. 2006. REAP REWARDS: Maximizing benefits from reviewer comments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49:191–196.

THE ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL BEST REVIEWERS AWARDS FOR 2005

Each year at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, the *Journal* honors a few of its many fine reviewers with the Academy of Management Journal Best Reviewers Award. Heartfelt thanks and congratulations from the editorial team go out to this year's recipients:

Peter Bamberger

Susan Jackson

Elizabeth Morrison

Jean Bartunek

David Ketchen

Freek Vermeulen

Gilad Chen

Kyle Mayer

William Wan