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Importance of Reviewing

• Contribute to your field, strengthening the field by sharing your insights
• Develop other authors’ contributions
• Improve your writing skills by learning from other Reviewers/ the Associate Editors
• Generate new ideas, pushing the boundaries of the field
• Become visible in the field, to receive recognition (best reviewer rewards at SIM and/or some journals, Business and Society)
Developmental Reviewer Skills

Rethinking the Role of Reviewer - Take a collegial role, think about what can be done to make the paper publishable in the appropriate forum

Imagining Face-To Face-Conversations - Pose questions that help authors flesh out their ideas or identify the boundary conditions or assumptions in their work

Focusing on the Author - Facilitate learning and development
Developmental Reviewing

What It Is
• Help authors envision a way to improve their work.
• Helps authors realize the potential of their ideas.
• Dig deep into the manuscript, suspend judgment, listen to the authors' voice, and try to take their perspective.
• Developmental reviewing takes time and commitment. It also asks the reviewer to acquire a new set of skills and embrace a different perspective on the review process.

What It Isn’t
• Not just a positive sandwich, where you say a few nice things about the paper in addition to a long list of criticisms.
• Not Ghostwriting.
• Not a Hierarchical Apprenticeship (Not telling the reviewers exactly what to do).
• Not Just for Newcomers.

Belle Rose Ragins, 2015: Editor’s Comments: Developing our Authors. AMR, 40, 1-8, https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0477
Example of Developmental Reviewing – “Firms’ Response to Slacktivism: When and Why are E-Petitions Effective?”

- **R1.1. First Set of Concerns:** I think the Introduction requires a major overhaul and the hypothesis setup (pp. 5 - 19, which I will now call Section 2) needs to be cut down, and that these two are connected. Section 2 is strong and fairly clear, but little of this clarity is evident in the Intro. At the same time, the hypothesis section, although clear, is repetitive and doesn’t need to be. I think the best course of action is to address these points together.

- More specifically, in terms of the Introduction, your core question and core contributions are not very clear. You dance around a number of points, but do not state clearly your core focus (as I interpret it): there are strong arguments to expect that e-petitions will not matter, but we posit that there are reasons that they might matter, and we have a good dataset to test this core hypothesis.

- This seems to be a clear and compelling hook, but this does not come out in a clear and compelling way in the Intro. The good news is that I think you can move some of the clearer writing in the beginning of Section 2 (which is repetitive) to the Introduction.
**General Advice for Reviewing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Begin with going through the manuscript, thinking about the strengths and weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be</td>
<td>Be constructive in terms of tone and suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize</td>
<td>Organize your review (following Jill's suggestions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide</td>
<td>Provide the author with some specific advice, such as the “nuggets” that they should develop, research conversations they may want to join, additional articles that they may want to reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organize Your Review

• Very brief summary of the manuscript and the article’s strengths and weaknesses.
• Research question: Is it clear? Is it unique and innovative?
• Theory: Does the manuscript have a strong conceptual premise? Does the theory contribute to the development of the hypotheses?
• Novelty/Contribution: Does the manuscript examine new constructs and phenomena?
• Methodology: Was the study well-executed?
• Summary: What can be done to make this publishable?

*Before hitting “submit” be sure to review and edit. Consider whether it is a laundry list or stream of consciousness. Number your points and categorize them as above.*
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