



Industry and Innovation

Editor Direct Decision (EDD) Track

At *Industry and Innovation*, we recognize the importance of innovating, responding to stakeholder concerns, and learning from other organizations' best practices. In recent years, an increasing number of promising manuscripts have faced obstacles in their publication due to lengthy review processes, at times characterized by divergent reviewer comments that authors struggle to reconcile. Both junior and senior scholars have encountered this hurdle, which can create high barriers to knowledge advancement and career progression. As a result, novel and important research findings are sometimes published (if they are published at all) with long delays, leading many scholars to lose faith in the ultimate value of peer review. Moreover, this process wastes a scarce yet fundamental resource—reviewers' time—as papers rejected after a long review process are then often submitted to another journal, where new reviewers are involved.

Neither editors nor reviewers are to blame for this problem. As scholars, we devote a substantial amount of our time to the review process, and we do so generously and with the best intentions. Nevertheless, we believe there is room to improve the process. At *Industry and Innovation*, we aim to provide timely and constructive feedback to our community of scholars, and to help authors navigate the review process when reviewers' suggestions are conflicting, very costly to implement, and/or redundant in light of previous revisions. Therefore, authors can consult with us if, within the same round of revisions, they are asked to make critical choices because reviewers' recommendations cannot be fully addressed or satisfied for the aforementioned reasons.

Furthermore, *Industry and Innovation* is now testing an **Editor Direct Decision (EDD) Track** targeted at unpublished papers that have previously received a Revise and Resubmit (R&R) decision from another journal. While this may appear to be a radical innovation, we are not the first to introduce this type of initiative. In fact, we stand on the shoulders of giants, as we are following the steps taken by high-quality journals in other social science domains, such as the [Review of Finance](#). *Industry and Innovation* wishes to contribute to this movement towards a more supportive and timely review process, starting with specific types of manuscripts that show high potential but have faced the abovementioned obstacles due to the “Union Heuristic” ([Harvey and Hirshleifer, 2020](#)). This practice requires authors to address all

reviewers' suggestions, even if they are unlikely to significantly enhance the manuscript's final contribution, before a paper can be accepted for publication.

A submission can be considered under *Industry and Innovation's* **EDD Track** if **one** of the following applies:

- a) The paper addresses a novel and interesting innovation-related research question, received an R&R decision from another journal, and was subsequently rejected (after one or more rounds of revision) because the Union Heuristic was applied (e.g., one reviewer finds that some comments were not satisfactorily addressed) and/or because a reviewer raised new concerns that were not (but should have been) raised in the first round of revisions. To be considered for *Industry and Innovation's* **EDD Track**, the remaining reviewers must have indicated their satisfaction with the revisions implemented by the authors and indicated their positive view of the paper's likelihood of publication by the journal (i.e., they recommended accepting the paper or made minor suggestions that could be easily incorporated).
- b) The paper addresses a novel and interesting innovation-related research question and received an R&R decision from another journal. The authors were advised to address *all* of the reviewers' comments before the paper could be reconsidered for publication (i.e., the authors did not receive any guidance on what to prioritize in their revision, even though some reviewers provided contradictory suggestions or demanded revisions that would be very costly to implement). The authors believed that the requested revisions would lower the quality of the paper or add limited value in terms of contribution, rigor, or novelty. Therefore, they decided against revising and resubmitting the paper to that journal. In this case, it is the authors' responsibility to withdraw the paper from the other journal before submitting it to *Industry and Innovation*.

Under either of these circumstances, the scholarly community is welcome to consider the **EDD Track** at *Industry and Innovation* and follow these steps:

- a) During the *Industry and Innovation* submission process, select "Research Article" from the drop-down menu under "Submission Types." Attach a cover letter to the Editors-in-Chief specifying the intention to be considered under the **EDD Track**.
- b) Include the decision letters and reviewer reports received during all review rounds at the previous journal. These documents must be submitted under "Supplementary Material for Review."
- c) In the cover letter, describe:
 - i. Any changes (if any) that have been implemented in the paper since the last version received an R&R decision at the previous journal; and
 - ii. Which recommendations made by the previous journal's reviewers the authors are willing to incorporate and which are they against, along with clear explanations.

Papers submitted to the **EDD Track** will be assessed by the Editors-in-Chief and assigned to an Associate Editor, who will then carefully review the package (i.e., paper,

authors' cover letter, reviewer reports, and previous decision letters) and possibly consult other members of the Editorial Board without involving external reviewers. The Associate Editor assigned to the paper will then issue one of three possible decisions, hopefully within six weeks:

- a) Accept (or “Conditionally Accept” if only minor changes are needed);
- b) Reject; or
- c) Revise and Resubmit (with only one round of revisions before the final decision).

If the Associate Editor issues an R&R decision, that Editor will explain the issues that must be addressed for the paper to be considered for publication by *Industry and Innovation*. These issues may include aspects raised by previous reviewers that the authors would prefer not to address if such issues are deemed essential for publication. The Associate Editor will only raise additional concerns if the reviewers at the previous journal missed any critical issues. Papers that receive an R&R under the **EDD Track** will undergo only one round of revision, after which the Associate Editor will make a final decision (Accept or Reject) based on the changes implemented by the authors.

In addition to the above criteria, papers targeting the **EDD Track** must fulfill all of the following conditions:

- a) The paper fits the [Aims and Scope](#) of *Industry and Innovation* and adds novelty to the innovation research agenda.
- b) The latest R&R was issued by a journal that has continually been classified as A+ (or 4*) in the last three [ABS-AJG rankings](#) (i.e., AJG 2021, AJG 2018, and AJG 2015). We are open to submissions that have received an R&R from journals in different fields (e.g., economics, management, strategy, international business, sociology) as long as the focal journal satisfies this requirement and was the last journal to which the paper was submitted (i.e. the paper was not submitted elsewhere after having received this R&R).
- c) The time elapsed since the last decision at the journal mentioned in b) is less than three years (i.e., less than three years have passed since (i) the paper was rejected after revision or (ii) received an R&R decision, after which the authors withdrew the paper).

Papers that do not fit the **EDD Track** criteria or that are rejected under this Track in the first decision round may still be submitted to *Industry and Innovation* as regular submissions. In that case, the paper will be assigned to a new Associate Editor who has not been involved in and is not aware of the **EDD Track** submission, and to at least two anonymous reviewers.

Authors interested in the **EDD Track** are welcome to contact the Editors-in-Chief of *Industry and Innovation* (Alessandra Perri: aperri@luiss.it and Vera Rocha: vr.si@cbs.dk) with any remaining questions.

April 11th, 2022

References

Harvey, Campbell R. and David Hirshleifer (2020): “Up or Out: Resetting Norms for Peer Reviewed Publishing in the Social Sciences.” <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3744513>