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Purpose of this tutorial ...

Understanding the fundamentals - reasons to publish; types of journal; storage and retrieval; indexing and abstracting

Preparing the article - self evaluation; getting the basics right; finding appropriate journals; choosing an MOT journal

The standing of journals - citation indices; national and institutional journal rankings

Getting the article right - what is “quality” in an article?

The key tests when preparing the article; final steps before submission; enabling electronic dissemination and searching

The review process - possible outcomes; reasons articles are rejected; typical feedback from referees; revising a paper

Other insights - “tricks of the trade” journal review forms; online submission and review (editors’ and reviewers’ perspectives)
Why publish in a refereed journal?  
- apart from getting a job, tenure or promotion!!!

It demonstrates your work has been reviewed - material that has been published in a refereed journal carries a “QA” stamp. Someone apart from the author thinks it is worth reading...

It is a permanent record of your work that is accessible to others and becomes part of a “body of knowledge”.

Being published electronically (by a publisher) is becoming the same as being published in hard copy in terms of verification and reliability - and it is even more accessible.
Some relevant definitions ......

**Archival journal** - a journal that is kept in an archive (hard copy or electronic), but also publishing papers that will have “lasting importance and value over time”. Papers are always peer reviewed and contain “an overview of the state-of-the-art (with references to other’s and the author’s own past work), a problem statement or question, the concept of a solution, a discussion of the theoretical background, experimental design, sound measurement of data, an evaluation of the results, discussion and conclusions”.

**Peer reviewed journal** - indicates that the articles published in the journal have been reviewed by appropriate subject scholars to determine the validity and value of the publication.

**Selective journal** - exercises more rigorous editorial control over its content.

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI)** - the modern electronic system for identifying where an article is located. The DOI remains permanent even if the location is changed (unlike the URL address). Assists with electronic archiving and retrieval.
The 2 basic refereeing tests for a peer reviewed journal

Test i) Do the paper’s data support the conclusions? (RIGOUR) and

Test ii) Do the conclusions represent a conceptual advance for the field of study? (RELEVANCE)

For an “archival journal”, test i) is necessary - and for a “selective journal”, both tests i) and ii) are necessary

But (according to IEEE) .... “An archival journal should publish the important, significant extensions of the state of the art” (Publication Guidelines for IEEE Transactions on Reliability, Vol. 58, No. 3, September 2009)
Storage and retrieval of archived journal articles

DOI indexing

http://dx.doi.org/ (+ DOI number)
Metadata about the article is stored in association with the DOI name and this metadata may include a location, such as a URL, where the object can be found. The DOI for a document is permanent, whereas its location and other metadata may change.

For some journals the DOI number is allocated after publication, while those with online submission and review can often allocate the DOI number when the paper goes into production as part of the “production tracking system” (PTS).
Indexing and abstracting services
(these provide search facilities and links to articles + sometimes shortened or summarised version. They also assign descriptors for referencing them)
....some examples:

ABI/INFORM (Proquest - CSA/CIG) www.proquest.com
(Also Materials Business File & METADEX)
Compendex (Engineering Index) www.ei.org/compendex
CrossRef www.crossref.org/
DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) www.doaj.org
EBSCO www.ebscohost.com
Emerald Management Reviews www.emeraldinsight.com/reviews
Google Scholar www.scholar.google.com
INSPEC www.theiet.org/inspec
JSTOR www.jstor.org
Open J-Gate www.openj-gate.com
Scopus www.scopus.com
SPARC Europe www.sparceurope.org
Some advice on preparing an article
- the self evaluation

What?
The purpose - what is the article about?

Why?
Its significance and originality - why is it important or different?

What next?
The implications for research - what further studies are implied?

So what?
The implications for practice.
Getting the basics right ....

• Pick the right journal. Many papers are rejected simply because they don’t fulfil the journal requirements.

• They don’t even go into the review process because the article is not aimed at the journal’s readership or does not fall within the subject area of the journal.

..... So, read the journal’s editorial aims and read at least one issue of the journal!
Getting the **basics** right ....

- Find out who best to submit your paper to (editor, regional editor, subject area editor) - check journal home pages or publisher web site

- If allowed by the editor send an outline or abstract first and ask if it looks appropriate. Confirm how the journal receives submissions - email attachment; hard copy (copies .... How many?)

Read the author guidelines and format the paper as required (referencing etc.)
Finding appropriate journals for your work ... - making a start

Ulrichsweb Global Serials Directory
www.ulrichsweb.com

Ingenta
www.ingentaconnect.com

Cabell’s
www.cabells.com
Cabell’s Directories of Publishing Opportunities
www.cabells.com

Business Directories Relevant to MOT:
Management
Economics & Finance

The Cabell’s Directory helps authors determine which journal will most likely accept the manuscript. In making the decision, it is important to compare the manuscript’s characteristics and the needs of each journal. The following table provides a framework for making this comparison.
Cabell’s Journal Information

Information provided by the Directory for each journal

Manuscript characteristics

Topic(s) of Articles

Theme

Manuscript Guidelines

Significance of Theme

Acceptance Rate

Percentage of Invited Articles

Methodology and Style

Type of Reader

Prestige

Launch Date

Review Process

Number of Reviewers

Results of Review

Availability of Reviewers

Comments

Time Required for Reviewer

Note: Journal information is provided by publishers and may not be audited
**Cabell’s Advice to Authors:**
Because the author is limited to submitting a manuscript to only one journal and the review process for each journal requires a long period of time, contacting the editors of the journals may help the author determine which journal is most likely to publish the manuscript. To interest the editor, the author should provide the following information:

- Topic, major idea or conclusion of the manuscript
- The subject sample, research setting conceptual framework, methodology type of organization or location
- The reasons why the author thinks the journal’s readers would be interested in the proposed article
- Requests for comments or suggestions on the usefulness of this type of article to the journal

While contacting the editor is helpful in selecting a journal that will be likely to publish the manuscript, the author could use the directory and framework to develop a number of journals which would be likely to publish the manuscript. With this number of possible journals, contacting the editor is more feasible and tends to achieve the objective of finding the journal most likely to publish the manuscript.
### Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management

**Cabell's Commendable Journal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION PROCESS:</th>
<th>REVIEW PROCESS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Submission Required Via Online Portal <a href="http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jmtm">http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jmtm</a></td>
<td>Acceptance Rate: 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION:</th>
<th>MANUSCRIPT SPECIFICATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Bennett, Editor</td>
<td>Manuscript Style:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management</td>
<td>See Manuscript Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston Business School</td>
<td>Manuscript Length:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston University</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham B4 7ET United Kingdom</td>
<td>Copies Required:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: +44 121 204 3000</td>
<td>Electronic Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:d.j.bennett@aston.ac.uk">d.j.bennett@aston.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>Reader:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.emeraldinsight.com/jmtm.htm">www.emeraldinsight.com/jmtm.htm</a></td>
<td>Academics, Business Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLICATION INFORMATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor/Publisher:</th>
<th>TOPICS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Group Publishing Limited</td>
<td>Production/Operations; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Issue:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Times/Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed: 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSN:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed: 1741-038X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Time to Review:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind Review</td>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invited Articles:</th>
<th>Reviewer’s Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-House Reviewers:</th>
<th>External Reviewers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer’s Time: 6 Weeks**
Choosing a journal for your paper in MOT
1. “Mainstream” MOT Journals

IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management
International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management
International Journal of Technology Intelligence and Planning
International Journal of Technology Management
International Journal of Technoentrepreneurship
Journal of Engineering and Technology Management
Journal of High Technology Management Research
Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management
Journal of Technology Management and Innovation
Journal of Technology Transfer
Technology Analysis & Strategic Management
Technovation
Choosing a journal for your paper in MOT

2. Innovation Management Journals

Creativity & Innovation Management
Economics of Innovation and New Technology
European Journal of Innovation Management
Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice
International Journal of Business Innovation and Research
International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management
International Journal of Foresight and Innovation Policy
International Journal of Innovation and Learning
International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development
International Journal of Innovation Management
International Journal of Product Innovation Management
Innovation Policy and the Economy
R&D Management
Choosing a journal for your paper in MOT - Some other relevant journals (depends on the orientation of the paper - there are very many more...)

Information Technology and People
International Journal of Business Information Systems
International Journal of Operations and Production Management
Journal of Business Venturing
Journal of Information Technology
Journal of Knowledge Management
Journal of Operations Management
Journal of Quality Technology
Management Science
MIS Quarterly
OMEGA - The International Journal of Management Science
Research Policy
Etc., etc., etc.,.....
The standing of journals - citation indices ...

Journal Impact Factor (JIF) - part of the Journal Citation Report (JCR), a product of Thomson Reuters (hence a publisher’s commercial product). Driven by Web of Knowledge (10,600 journals - 8,000 science / 2,600 social science) JIF is the frequency with which the "average article" in a WOK indexed journal has been cited in other WOK indexed journals over a 3 year period (Note: WOK was formerly known as ISI).

http://wokinfo.com

Examples:
Technovation JIF = 3.287
Journal of Engineering and Technology Management JIF = 1.032
IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management JIF = 0.958
International Journal of Technology Management JIF = 0.516
Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management (not WOK listed)
Research Technology Management (not WOK listed)
SCImago Journal Rank (SJR / H-index) - produced by Scimago Lab
Driven by Elsevier’s Scopus product (19,500 journals) SJR is the average number of weighted citations received in the selected year by the documents published in the selected journal in the three previous years. SJR attributes different weight to citations depending on the "prestige" of the citing journal without the influence of journal self-citations.

H-index is a journal's number of articles ("h") that have received at least "h" citations from 1996.
www.scimagojr.com

Examples:
Technovation SJR = 1.478 / H-Index = 45
Journal of Engineering and Technology Management SJR 0.918 / H-Index = 32
IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management SJR = 0.778 / H-index = 47
Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management SJR = 0.578 / H-Index = 29
Research Technology Management SJR = 0.378 / H-index = 34
International Journal of Technology Management SJR = 0.372  H-Index = 29
Google Scholar Metrics (h5-index and h5-median)
Like the Google Search Engine, Google Scholar uses “Googlebots”, which are Google's web-crawling robots, to collect documents from the web, filter out the results, and make them available via the Google Scholar interface. It uses a built in algorithm that makes an assessment of what it thinks is a scholarly source. In theory it captures every piece of scholarly output that is published online.

“h5-index” for a journal is the h-index for articles published in the last 5 complete years. It is the largest number “h” such that h articles published in 2007-2011 have at least “h” citations each.

“h5-median” for a journal is the median number of citations for the articles that make up its h5-index.


Examples:
Technovation  h5-index = 49
IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management  h5-index = 29
Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management  h5-index = 21
International Journal of Technology Management  h5-index = 20
Research Technology Management  h5-index = 19
Journal of Engineering and Technology Management (no metrics in Google Scholar)
Other national and institutional journal rankings

The Association of Business Schools [www.the-abs.org.uk](http://www.the-abs.org.uk) (>800 business journals)

Australian Research Council [www.arc.gov.au](http://www.arc.gov.au) (19,500 journals in all subjects)

“Harzing” Journal Quality List [www.harzing.com](http://www.harzing.com) (920 business journals)

Financial Times Global MBA journal rank [www.ft.com](http://www.ft.com) (40 academic and practitioner journals)

UTD (University of Texas at Dallas) journals used in Rankings of Business Schools Based on Research Contribution [http://top100.utdallas.edu](http://top100.utdallas.edu) (24 journals)
Some tips about getting the article right
- what is ‘quality’? ....

“The totality of features and characteristics that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs” (ISO 9000)
Does the article have the characteristics that the readership would expect from a contribution to the journal in question?

e.g.

- originality?
- academic rigour? (depending on journal)
- practical relevance? (depending on journal)
- worthwhile conclusions?
Getting the article right
... more ‘quality’ definitions ..

“Fitness for purpose or use” (Juran)
Is the article ‘accessible’ to the reader? e.g.
- clearly written?
- figures or tables to support text?
- adequate references and notes?
- checked for typographical errors?

“Conformance to requirements” (Crosby)
Does the article match the editorial aims and is it prepared according to the required format? e.g.
- right type of article for the journal in question?
- correct length?
- headings and subheadings prepared according to instructions?
- sources properly referenced in text and listed as required?
Key tests ......

• Readability - does it communicate?

• Originality - why was it written? What’s new and important about the topic or treatment?

• Credibility - do the conclusions seem valid? Is the methodology robust? Is it clear? Don’t over-promise.
Key tests ......

- Applicability - how do findings apply to the world of managerial practice? How do they provoke further research?

- Internationality - does it take an international, global, trans-national perspective? (the readership of journals is usually international)
Summarise and conclude....

- Re-state main arguments,
- Present key conclusions,
- Recommendations,
- Ideas for other readers and
- Prompts for further research
After writing, but before submitting ...

- Let someone else read it. Show a draft to one or more friends or colleagues and ask for their comments and honest criticisms.

- ALWAYS: proof-check thoroughly - spelling; grammar; complete references....

If in doubt use the services of a professional editor....
Enable electronic dissemination and searching...

• Use descriptive titles

• Write clear and descriptive abstracts (these are used for searching)

• Make your references complete and correct
Same author, same journal ... why does one article have many more citations than the other?

**Lean viewed as a philosophy**
S Bhasin, P Burcher - ... *Manufacturing Technology Management*, 2006 - emeraldinsight.com
Purpose—The purpose of this paper is to act as a meticulous conceptual paper probing the contemporary view towards lean and illustrate that, despite its discernible benefits, the implementation record suffers as the prevailing opinion fails to encapsulate that an ...
Cited by 209  Related articles  BL Direct  All 6 versions  Cite

**Lean and performance measurement**
Purpose—Ostensibly, less than 10 per cent of UK organisations accomplish successful lean implementations. A refined system to the one offered by the balanced scorecard is needed. The purpose of this paper is to propose a robust system that not only focuses on the ...
Cited by 41  Related articles  BL Direct  All 2 versions  Cite
Same journal and same search terms
(R&D | product development | knowledge transfer | innovation)

Transferring R&D knowledge: the key factors affecting knowledge transfer success
JL Cummings, BS Teng - ... of Engineering and Technology Management, 2003 - Elsevier
... to be challenging, although its success is often critical in new product development (NPD) related ... a transfer project (Sowell, 1980), it is easy to see how many R&D acquisitions, alliances ... This paper begins with a brief overview of knowledge transfer research from the technology ...
Cited by 632  Related articles  All 11 versions  Cite

Coordinating customers and proactive suppliers: a case study of supplier collaboration in product development
F Von Corswant, C Tunalv - ... of Engineering and Technology Management, 2002 - Elsevier
... The study showed, for example, that expected transfer of knowledge from the supplier's production facility might ... Technology fusion and the new R&D. In: Clark, KB, Wheelwright, SC (Eds.), The Product Development Challenge: Competing Through Speed, Quality and Creativity. ...
Cited by 87  Related articles  All 3 versions  Cite

Knowledge management challenges in new business development: Case study observations
H Berends, W Vanhaverbeke, R Kirschbaum - ... Technology Management, 2007 - Elsevier
... Business units with short-term profit responsibility will only approve R&D and product development that ... the speed on the polymerization of Polyamide 6, a core product for DSM. ... Several groups were involved in the development and pilot manufacturing of PolyLEDs, including ...
Cited by 37  Related articles  All 11 versions  Cite

... why the differences in number of citations?
When submitting ....

• Comply with all manuscript requirements
• Proof read the paper thoroughly
• Seek permissions from copyright holders of republished content
• Seek permission to publish from named organizations as necessary
• Submit as instructed by the journal
A typical review process ...

1. Reviewed by the General Editor (or Associate Editors) for general suitability (editorial scope of journal and basic quality test)

2. Double blind review process
Referees possibly selected from:
Editorial Advisory Board
Panel of Referees
Ad hoc referees (normally selected when special expertise is required)

N.B. Sometimes referees are chosen from cited authors or authors who have published on similar or related topics in the journal.
A typical review process ...

Possible outcomes

• Accept without revision (rare - and could be a sign of a lower standing journal that is short of copy)

• Minor revisions (possibly just checked by the Editor)

• Major revisions (normally require checking by original referees or second review)

• Reject (and possible invitation to resubmit for new review)
  - after review or desk rejection
Why are articles rejected? - typical reasons for failing to pass the 'general suitability' test (depends on journal) - often resulting in desk rejection

• Subject matter has only marginal relevance to the editorial aim and scope
  (Remedial action? - often no alternative but to rewrite the article - if feasible - or submit elsewhere)

• 'Review' article with propositions not supported by evidence*
  (Remedial action? - include research findings or case study analysis)

* N.B. ... but check whether the journal considers submission of review papers
Why are articles rejected? ......

• Theoretical article with no apparent practical (Remedial action? - test the theory by applying it in a 'real world' situation)

• 'Pure' case study description (Remedial action? - use data from case study to develop 'generic' recommendations and conclusions)
Rejection letters ....... some more helpful than others.

Reviewers' comments on your work have now been received. You will see that they are advising against publication of your work. Therefore I must reject it.

For your guidance, I append the reviewers' comments below. While you are likely disappointed, I hope that these comments will prove constructive and helpful.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work. We appreciate your interest in the Journal of Operations Management.

(A standard letter that does not mention the title of the submitted paper, nor does it summarise the reasons for rejection)

---------------------

Thank you for submitting your paper "XXXX" to the International Journal of Operations and Production Management. As you are aware we sent the paper to 2 reviewers, one recommended major revisions the second recommended rejection.

I am afraid that although there is clearly merit in the paper, on balance I don’t think that the literature base nor the findings are of sufficient interest to the IJOPM readership and therefore I am afraid that we are rejecting the paper.

(A tailored letter that provides a more explicit summary of the reasons for rejection - i.e problems of fit with the journal’s editorial scope)

---------------------

We have received the review from the Area Editor on your manuscript, "XXXX". I had concerns about the fit of the paper, but decided to send it to an Area Editor to give the paper the benefit of the doubt.

With regret, I must inform you that, based on the advice received, your manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in Operations Management Research.

(Desk rejection - because of concerns about fit, but precise reasons not specified)
The Review Process (example of blind refereeing)

Informal submission of abstract

- Not resubmitted
- Resubmitted
  - Abstract submitted
    - Suitability judged by Editor
      - Unsuitable
        - Resubmitted
        - Not resubmitted
      - Suitable
        - Article submitted
          - Suitability judged by Editor
            - Blind refereed
              - Suitable
                - Referees selected
                  - Resubmitted
                    - Not resubmitted
                    - Minor revisions
                      - Accept
                    - Major revisions
                      - Reject
        - Not resubmitted
  - Not resubmitted

Editor/Referees Assess Revisions

- Not resubmitted
- Minor revisions
  - Accept
- Major revisions
  - Reject

Publish
The Decision!

A request for revision is probably good news! You are now in the publishing cycle. Nearly every published paper is revised at least once.

Don’t give up if some referee’s comments are sharp or discouraging. Referees often have big egos, but not usually Editors ... they are experienced and will make an overall judgement based on the balance of comments. If necessary ask the Editor about the review comments.

... but remember, papers can still be rejected after revision.
Types of feedback from referees....

- Typical reviewers' comments requiring minor revisions, e.g.
  - more detail required of certain aspects
  - English needs to be improved
  - insufficient references

- Typical reviewers' comments requiring major revisions, e.g.
  - poor structure
  - inadequate description of experimental procedure
  - serious errors of fact
Types of feedback from referees....

- Typical reviewers' reasons for recommending rejection, e.g.
  - lack of originality
  - no contribution to knowledge
  - work not of sufficiently high level

Note ..... Referees do not always agree, in which case an editorial judgement may often be made or a further opinion sought
Revising a paper ....

• Acknowledge the editor and agree a revision deadline (often built in to online submission and review procedures).

• If necessary, clarify your understanding of the comments.

• Consult with colleagues or co-authors and attend to the points requested (but do not be tempted to add too much that is new - this may make you a hostage to fortune!).
Revising a paper ....

• Meet the revision deadline, or request an extension and provide an explanation for the delay.

• Even if not requested, provide a list of revisions and how they address the referees’ comments. This helps the Editor as well as the reviewers and can clarify confusions, so sometimes is critical.

• Provide justification for anything you have not changed.
Revising a paper ....

• If the paper is rejected without clear reason ask why...

• If you are confident about the work try to make the paper better, and resubmit somewhere else. Target the paper as closely as you can to another journal.

.... Don’t give up! At least 50% of papers in business and management do not get published. Almost everybody has a paper rejected sometime. .... keep trying
Some “tricks of the trade” - by journals

- Creating a “long established” journal by publishing more than one volume per year (check the launch date)

- Manipulating the paper acceptance rate to give an impression of a rigorous review process (can sometimes be checked from manuscript numbers allocated and the actual number of papers published)

- Encouraging (or requiring) self-citations of the journal by authors before submission or acceptance (and asking reviewers if the number of self-citations is “sufficient”)

- Inflating the journal’s esteem by inviting the “great and the good” to be members of the Editorial Board.

- Using the title “International Journal of .... “ for a national journal (check the authors of past papers)
Some “tricks of the trade” - by authors

- Staying in touch with the Editor in a polite (not annoying) way.
- Keeping the process moving .... if the reviews are overdue (but not before), diplomatically asking the Editor about progress.
- Co-authoring with senior and recognisable academics who may not have contributed significantly to the paper (even with blind review the Editor may still be influenced).
- Making multiple submissions of the same or very similar papers to different journals (not usually permitted and they may go to the same reviewers who will inform the editors).
- Plagiarism .... Understand what this is and do not try it ... Either the reviewers will recognise that it is not original or someone will “blow the whistle” after publication...
Some standard journal review forms ........

(Note: online submission and review platforms have more standardised review documents and reduced the scope for providing journal-specific reviewer feedback)
JOURNAL OF MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT
- ARTICLE REVIEW FORM -

(Continue on a separate sheet and/or return marked-up manuscript if necessary)

EDITORIAL AIM: The journal aims to provide a broad coverage of subjects relating to the management of manufacturing technology and the integration of the production, design, supply and marketing functions of manufacturing enterprises. JMTM has a wide readership, which includes both practitioners and academics.

EDITORIAL SCOPE: Manufacturing strategy formulation; Design and implementation of manufacturing systems; Technology transfer and dissemination in manufacturing industries; Automation of manufacturing processes and systems; Computer-aided production management and the various elements of computer integrated manufacture; Information systems in manufacturing; Modelling and simulation of manufacturing systems; Design for manufacture and simultaneous/concurrent engineering; Human factors and work organization; The design of quality management systems and quality control; Purchasing and materials management; Supply chain management and logistics systems; Manufacturing performance and productivity measurement. Articles may be of a theoretical nature, based on practical experience, report a case study situation or report experimental results. Their length should be between 3,000 and 6,000 words.

Article title: Is the content of the article within the editorial aims and scope of the journal?

Does the title of the article accurately reflect its content?

Does the article demonstrate originality of theory, practice or application, or is it an original case study?

Does the article make a significant contribution to knowledge or is it a useful illustration of ‘good practice’?

Is the length of the article appropriate for the subject matter covered?

Is the article clearly written, accurate and, given its likely readership, is the terminology adequately explained?

Is adequate credit given to the work of others in the field and are the references sufficiently comprehensive?

If the length of the article appears excessive are you able to suggest how it can be condensed to fit within the limit, including reductions in the number of figures, tables, references etc?

Are there any other changes you would recommend are made to the article?

Is the article suitable for publication in "Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management" in its current or revised form?

Other comments....

Return to: David Bennett, Editor JMTM
Aston Business School,
Aston University,
Birmingham B4 7ET, UK
Fax: +44 (0)121 204 5271
E-mail: d.j.bennett@aston.ac.uk
Referee Report Form
DSS # __________________
Date: _______________
Title of Paper: ________________________________________
Author(s): ________________________________________

EVALUATION (remove options other than your choice, or highlight your option):

Relevance to DSS Poor / Below Average / Average / Good / Very Good
Information content Poor / Below Average / Average / Good / Very Good
Originality Poor / Below Average / Average / Good / Very Good
Clarity Poor / Below Average / Average / Good / Very Good
Validity Poor / Below Average / Average / Good / Very Good

RECOMMENDATION (please mark your decision with an ‘X’):
Unconditional acceptance
Conditional acceptance
Publishable as short note / tutorial
Rejection
Publishable, but not in Decision Support Systems

COMMENTS TO AUTHOR(S):
CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (optional):
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF VALUE CHAIN MANAGEMENT

Papers submitted to International Journal of Value Chain Management must be clear, original, strongly related to the subject, concise, complete, with precise logic, and honestly appraised.

Paper No.: Reviewer: Date:
Title: Acquisition planning of returns in managing reverse logistics

PAPER PROFILE
Place a check in the boxes which, in your opinion, best describe the following features of the manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originality of the work</th>
<th>Poor*</th>
<th>Marginal*</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Honours*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/industrial relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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