From Here to There: *CQ's* Review and Publication Practices

From the Editor

Michael C. Sturman

WITH THIS, MY SECOND ISSUE AS EDITOR of *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, I will take the opportunity to provide some detailed information on the process through which manuscripts are submitted and editorial decisions ultimately made. I am hopeful that this will prove useful to potential writers for *Cornell Quarterly*, and may also be informative to readers who want to know more about how papers get chosen for this journal.

At times I will invite certain authors to write specific papers for *Cornell Quarterly*. Some of these are high-quality papers that have appeared in other academic journals, and I invite those authors and the *Cornell Quarterly* editors to translate such articles into a practitioner-friendly format for the hospitality industry. Also, I may specifically invite some papers for a special-focus issue of *Cornell Quarterly* based on the author's particular expertise in a specific area. To date, I have invited 16 papers.

I welcome authors to send their unsolicited papers to me. Ideally, they will be sent electronically. They can be e-mailed to cq_submissions@cornell.edu, or directly to me at mcs5@cornell.edu. It makes no difference whether a manuscript is sent to one address or the other.

Once received at Cornell, the submission gets entered into a database, a number is assigned to the manuscript, and an e-mail is sent to the author to acknowledge receipt of the paper. I then read the manuscript, ideally within three days of its submission. At this point I make an initial editorial decision. The manuscript may be rejected without further review, sent out for review, accepted conditional on the author's making certain specific changes, or accepted as is. During the six months that I have been editor, I have received 77 unsolicited manuscripts: 37 percent were rejected in the initial editorial decision, 61 percent were sent to additional reviewers, and 3 percent were conditionally accepted.

As those numbers show, most papers are sent out to review. Manuscripts are generally sent to two reviewers who are experts in the content area of the paper (e.g., finance, marketing). Editorial-board members bear the brunt of this work: each board member may be called upon to review as many as six manuscripts a year. Currently, there are 43 editorial-board members—their names appear on page 2 of this issue. I also use *ad hoc* reviewers to review manuscripts, in part because I often need additional experts to help provide the necessary informed feedback. Those reviewers are called upon to provide feedback on up to two manuscripts a year. During my six-month tenure I have used 24 *ad hoc* reviewers. These reviewers work very hard for very little reward throughout the year. Although it is little compensation, I will make an effort in one issue each year to specifically thank all the reviewers by name for their help and support. Their names are listed on the facing page.

I ask my reviewers and editorial-board members to provide feedback within four to six weeks. On average, reviews have been completed within 27 days, and over 80 percent have come back within 42 days. Once comments are back from both reviewers, I read the paper again and make an editorial decision based on the reviewers' comments and my own reactions. This decision may be to (a) accept the paper as is, (b) accept the paper contingent on making certain specific changes, (c) reject the paper, but invite the authors to revise and resubmit the paper, or (d) reject the paper.

The final editorial decision is made, on average, in under 33 days. In the past six months (for the papers that have been sent off to review), 29 percent were rejected after review, 49 percent of the authors were given invitations to revise and resubmit, and 24 percent were conditionally accepted. Of those authors who were invited to revise and resubmit their papers, 60 percent of the resubmitted papers were conditionally accepted or accepted upon resubmission. All papers resubmitted after conditional acceptance were accepted. Once accepted, papers are forwarded to the executive and managing editors for copyediting. Those editors revise the article and seek the authors' feedback on and approval of the final versions. Then the papers are prepared for publication.

In short, during the six months of my tenure as editor, 93 papers have been considered for publication: 31 percent (n = 28) of those papers have been accepted for publication, 43 percent (40) were rejected, and the remaining 25 are in various stages of the review process. The intent of this summary is to provide clear information about the review process. I hope it proves useful. In the next issue, I will write about the type of content I am looking for and, more important, how such papers can be framed so that they may be published in *Cornell Quarterly.*—M.C.S.

Acknowledgment of Reviewers

With the December issue, and the close of 2002, I will take this opportunity to thank the many reviewers who contributed their time and expertise to review manuscripts for *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. The 24 people listed on the right have served as external *ad hoc* reviewers for me since I began my role as editor, on July 1, 2002. Thank you all for your excellent service.

I will also take this opportunity to make a call for additional reviewers. The continued success and usefulness of *Cornell Quarterly* depends on the quality of submissions and the feedback that we provide to authors. As the number of submissions increases, there is a greater burden on our current editorial board and *ad hoc* reviewers. Increasing the number of reviewers and, specifically, the breadth and depth of reviewers' available expertise, will help to ensure that we can continue to publish high-quality articles in the future. Given the time and effort required to complete quality reviews, no more than two manuscripts will be sent to *ad hoc* reviewers in any given year. If you are interested in becoming a reviewer and believe that you may be qualified, please send your résumé or vita directly to me (mcs5@cornell.edu).