



ACADEMY OF  
Management

---

# Perspectives

---

## What We Are Looking for in Manuscript Reviews

As a member of the Academy of Management, *AMP* is committed to publishing the very best ideas that emanate from the membership, for dissemination to management and organization scholars and researchers in related domains. To do this effectively, we depend on experts like yourself to provide timely, constructive, and insightful reviews. We thank you in advance for your contributions to this mission.

*AMP*'s mission is to publish papers with policy implications based on management research. *AMP* articles leverage management theory to understand contemporary behavioral, socioeconomic, and technological trends, highlighting their implications for the public interest or relying on a strong evidence base of empirical findings to inform public policy. Authors develop connections between management evidence and public policy concerns by (i) critically assessing the impact of management theory and research on public policy; (ii) summarizing empirical evidence to emphasize their policy implications; (iii) identifying policy concerns that should motivate the development of new management theory and research; and/or (iv) establishing a research agenda that informs public policy and to the academic community

High-quality manuscript reviews for *AMP* meet the following criteria: 1) are timely and adhere to reviewer guidelines; 2) give constructive, concise recommendations to both the editors and authors; 3) offer substantiated comments about the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments, presentation, and discussions; 4) comment on the importance, relevance and likely newsworthiness of the manuscript for readers; and 5) note any special issues. Explanations of these features are included below.

- **Timeliness and adherence to these reviewer guidelines:**  
Reviews should be completed on time. They should include summary grades, confidential comments for the editors, and comments for the authors. Reviewers should decline the opportunity to review if clear conflicts preclude balanced judgment or if knowledge of the manuscript's content might lead to direct personal or financial gain for the reviewer. Reviewers who believe that they will not be able to keep confidential the information contained in the manuscript should refrain from reviewing it. If less clear conflicts exist, reviewers should discuss potential conflicts with the editors before they begin the review.
- **Constructive, concise recommendations:**  
Reviews should provide editors with information that will be useful in deciding whether or not to reject a manuscript. They should suggest to the authors specific ways to improve the manuscript, even when they do not think that the journal should publish the manuscript. The tone of reviews should be constructive and avoid nit-picking or contentiousness. Except for specific recommendations regarding publication, all points made in the comments to Editor

should be appropriately translated into constructive criticisms for the authors, and the summary grades should be in accord with the written comments to the authors. Reviews should also be reasonably concise (1/2-1 single-spaced pages for comments to editors, and 2-5 single-spaced pages for comments to authors is the optimal length).

- **Substantiated comments about strengths and weaknesses:**

Reviews should comment explicitly on major strengths and weaknesses, validity, generalizability, and clarity of manuscripts. Good reviews point out strengths in the conceptualization, framing, and argumentation of the research question. They note the limitations that threaten the soundness of conclusions, and segregate major from minor flaws. They point out any unbalanced presentations, important missing or inaccurate information, faulty interpretations, or over-stated conclusions. They cite specifics to support criticisms. For example, if reviewers claim that a study is not novel, they cite the work that it replicates. If reviewers criticize the study population or arguments, they say why these are problematic. They also comment on the generalizability and applicability of the conclusions and note whether the manuscript describes the work well enough for the target audience to understand it.

- **Comments about importance, relevance, and likely newsworthiness:**

Reviews that are especially helpful to editors place the current work in the context of existing evidence in an area. They briefly describe the unique contributions and importance of the current work, and comment on any inconsistencies of the current work with previous research in the area. They give their opinions about the relevance and appropriateness of the manuscript for *AMP*'s readers, and comment on whether the paper is likely to influence policy. They note whether the manuscript provides only modest amounts of new information or whether it is newsworthy and provides information that most scholars don't already know.

- **Special issues:**

Reviews that note subtle but important aspects that might otherwise be missed (e.g., prior/redundant publication, ethical issues), or that bring unusual depth, insight, and expertise are particularly appreciated.