



University of
New Haven

American Business Review

Volume 25 | Number 1

Article 1

5-2022

Presenting Volume 25 and Celebrating ABR Reviewers

Kamal Upadhyaya
University of New Haven

Subroto Roy
University of New Haven

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.newhaven.edu/americanbusinessreview>

Recommended Citation

Upadhyaya, Kamal and Roy, Subroto (2022) "Presenting Volume 25 and Celebrating ABR Reviewers,"
American Business Review. Vol. 25: No. 1, Article 1.

DOI: 10.37625/abr.25.1.1-3

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.newhaven.edu/americanbusinessreview/vol25/iss1/1>

Presenting Volume 25 and Celebrating ABR Reviewers

American Business Review
May 2022, Vol.25(1) 1-3
© The Authors 2022, [CC BY-NC](#)
ISSN: 2689-8810 (Online)
ISSN: 0743-2348 (Print)

Kamal Upadhyaya^a and Subroto Roy^b

<https://doi.org/10.37625/abr.25.1.1-3>

We are delighted to present the first issue of volume 25 of ABR. We thought we would thank and celebrate our reviewers for their outstanding contribution to ABR on this occasion.

The peer-review process in academic publishing involves reviewers who have expertise in a domain (see Ali and Watson 2016). We thought we would explain the ABR review process as we celebrate our reviewers. We believe this would be interesting to authors and readers as this would give a glimpse of the peer review process at ABR.

Being a broad-based academic journal brings a discipline expertise challenge to the review process. The research must prima facie be relevant (interesting) and rigorous. But whether the ideas are an adequate contribution to a business discipline can be determined only by disciplinary scholars who study the area in the paper. For example, a CEO Compensation paper is interesting, at face value, to the ABR audience. But it must also seem like a contribution to HR scholars and specifically to the subset of scholars who study CEO Compensation. Thus, we humbly recognize that we do not know the potential contribution without expert reviewers' opinions, advice, and guidance.

Below we explain the ABR review process after receiving a submission in the ABR system. We also include requests to our valued reviewers.

BEFORE REVIEW REQUEST

Like other scholarly journals (see Lovejoy, Revenson, & France, 2011), our review process involves reading of the submission by one of us. We request authors to review the Aims and Scope of ABR and the tips for submitting authors in our May 2021 editorial (Upadhyaya and Roy 2021). If we believe that the article appears to investigate an interesting question, has established the gap in the literature, seems to follow sound methodology, and has useful results, we send out the paper for review. We aim to do this within six weeks as it is fairer for authors to receive an initial decision as soon as possible. Similarly, we recognize that reviewers are volunteers, and we try our best to send papers that seem to have potential at first sight. Reviewers include ABR Ed Board members, scholars cited by the authors, and scholars who are highly cited on the paper's topic.

ACCEPT OR DECLINE REVIEW REQUESTS IMMEDIATELY

We request reviewers to accept or decline the review request immediately. Reviewers can decline review requests for various reasons (see Tite & Schroter 2007). And we understand that you may have your own reasons to decline. Immediately declining a review is vital in keeping the journal decision process on track. Also, this early decision is a service to the author/s and the study of business in

^a Editor, American Business Review; Pompea College of Business, University of New Haven, West Haven, CT (KUpadhyaya@newhaven.edu)

^b Editor, American Business Review; Pompea College of Business, University of New Haven, West Haven, CT (SRoy@newhaven.edu)

general and your discipline in particular. Declining a review request is not impolite, and we would appreciate it if you could suggest other experts in your domain who might review the paper. We request this as you likely know the other experts in your field.

THE PEER REVIEW REPORT

The peer review report is your opportunity to shape your discipline and business generally. Consider that the author/s who receive your comments might have spent years developing the research and manuscript. A published article can be critical for the award of Ph.D.'s in many business programs globally and can be vital in the career progression of the author/s. It's therefore important to be frank and timely. But please be kind. See the Nature Research Editors Blog (2016) on what makes a helpful review. It's fine if you need more time to review – just let us know. We will let the author/s know.

Since we rely on your judgment of the manuscript's value, we look for your recommendation. You must decide in the first round if you want to move the paper forward by inviting a revision. This again is fair to the authors as it is better to hear of rejection sooner than later.

THE REVISION PROCESS

We invite author/s to revise based on reviewer recommendations. The author/s are requested to provide a separate document that addresses your comments and how/where these have been addressed in the revised manuscript. If reviewers recommend revision and author/s comprehensively address the reviewer's concerns, papers improve drastically. When major revisions are involved, papers are often sent out for a second round of reviews.

CALL FOR ABR EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

Given the large number of submissions we receive, we welcome new Ed Board Members to help. Ed Board members need to have an active Google Scholar profile and should have published in A/A* journals on the ABDC list. We try to restrict review requests to two papers per calendar year.

Thank you once again to our reviewers. The continued success of ABR has been possible due to your contributions.

REFERENCES

- Ali, P. A., & Watson, R. (2016). Peer review and the publication process. *Nursing Open*, 3(4), 193-202.
- Lovejoy, T. I., Revenson, T. A., & France, C. R. (2011). Reviewing manuscripts for peer-review journals: a primer for novice and seasoned reviewers. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 42(1), 1-13.
- Nature Research Editors Blog (2016) What makes a great peer reviewer:
<http://blogs.nature.com/ofschemesandmemes/2016/11/04/what-makes-a-great-peer-reviewer-tips-from-nature-research-editors>
- Tite, L., & Schroter, S. (2007). Why do peer reviewers decline to review? A survey. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 61(1), 9-12.
- Upadhyaya, K. P., & Roy, S. (2021). Introducing ABR Volume 24, May 2021: Some Tips for Submitting Authors. *American Business Review*, 24(1), 1-2.