

Information for Reviewers

Guidelines for Reviewers

Review Process

1. The Editor will do the first pass on all manuscripts, deciding which papers get desk rejected and which will go through the review process. A paper is desk rejected for three reasons:
 - a. it does not fit the focus of the journal,
 - b. it has a major flaw or flaws that cannot be fixed, and
 - c. it does not provide sufficient contribution to knowledge and/or to practice.Most papers that should be desk rejected will be. However, there may be instances in which a manuscript will be sent out for review and you as a reviewer might think, why did the Editorial Team send this to me? We understand that your time is valuable. But sometimes, getting the perspective of others beyond the Editorial Team is important to help develop young authors or to illustrate to particular authors that decisions are not biased or politically based. We cannot promise that you will never receive a manuscript that you think should have been desk rejected; however, we will do our best to limit such situations.
2. Papers selected to go through the review process will be handled by the Editorial Team, one of whom will email you asking to review a manuscript. Our goal is to have a minimum of two reviews for every paper in the review process. In addition, we plan to make a final decision about each paper by the 3rd round of reviews.
3. It is important that you respond promptly as to whether or not you can review the assigned paper. If you agree to review the manuscript, you will be sent another e-mail with a link to the JPIM ScholarOne website where you can download the paper. All papers will be double-blind so that reviewers will not be informed of the authors' identity and vice versa. As well, the authors will not know who of the Editorial Team is handling the review process for that manuscript until the paper is published.
4. Please use the JPIM ScholarOne website to submit your review. Also, kindly note that the reviewer form has been revised. Be sure to include separate, detailed comments on how the manuscript could be improved.
5. There are 4 options to choose from in making an overall recommendation:
 - _____ **Conditional Accept** means that the paper is almost perfect subject to minor editorial comments such as formatting issues. Papers that receive a conditional accept will not go back to the reviewers.
 - _____ **Revise and Resubmit with minor revisions** means that the theoretical and managerial contribution is clear and valuable, the methods are appropriate, and that only minor changes need to be made.

_____ **Revise and Resubmit with major revisions** should be used when a manuscript has a clear and valuable theoretical and managerial contribution but other important issues need to be addressed such as better framing of the problem, more theoretical support for the conceptual framework, different or additional data analysis undertaken, more detailed discussion of findings and/or implications.

_____ **Reject completely.** The paper does not make a sufficient contribution and/or has major/fatal flaws that can't be corrected.

6. The Associate Editors will synthesize the reviewer comments and provide these to the Editor who will be responsible for making final decisions regarding individual manuscripts.

In agreeing to serve as a reviewer for a manuscript, you assume the following responsibilities:

1. **To effectively evaluate manuscripts** – Your evaluation should address as many aspects of the paper as possible, given your level of expertise. At a minimum, it is expected that most reviewers will comment on
 - a. Significance of the research problem/question(s) being addressed
 - b. Theoretical underpinnings of the research problem/question(s)
 - c. Contribution to theory
 - d. Contribution to practice
 - e. Construction of the conceptual framework/theory
 - f. Appropriateness of the methodology – sample, measures, research design
 - g. Appropriateness and rigor of the analytical methods utilized
 - h. Quality of discussion, recommendations, and implications
 - i. Overall quality of the writing
2. **To provide developmental feedback to authors** – Your job is to help authors improve their manuscript whether it gets published in JPIM or elsewhere. The best reviews will clearly identify the strengths of the manuscript as well as point out areas for improvement. Please identify critical issues as early as possible; bring up fatal or potentially fatal concerns in the first round. Please resist bringing up new issues in later rounds unless new material has been added that triggered the new concerns. With regard to areas for improvement, detailed comments about each issue of concern and suggestions for how to rectify the concern will help authors to enhance their manuscripts.
3. **To provide a timely review** – Reviewers are given a maximum of 4 weeks for their review. Meeting review deadlines is important for authors as well as for the credibility of the journal. If you cannot meet the deadline due to some unforeseen event, please let the Editorial Team know
4. **Generative Artificial Intelligence use:** Please do not upload manuscripts you receive from JPIM to any Generative AI platform (e.g. ChatGPT). This is a violation of Wiley and JPIM copyrights. However, you are welcome to use such tools to edit your own reviews.

The Journal of Product Innovation Management appreciates the time and efforts of our reviewers. Your attention to these guidelines is important for preserving our position as the leading journal for scholars in the field of new product and service development. 4.

Publons

Reviewer Recognition

What is Publons?

[Publons](#) works with reviewers and publishers to give credit for peer review. Publons helps you to record, verify, and showcase your peer review contributions for use in promotion applications etc. You get credit even if your reviews are anonymous and the manuscript is never published.

How the partnership works

- When you review for *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, you can opt in to get credit on Publons, via a question on the ScholarOne review questionnaire.*
- Once your review is completed you will receive an email with a private link to claim your review
- Follow the link to add your review to your reviewer profile

** By selecting "yes" you are opting in to the Publons service and data about this review (including your name and the review itself) will be transferred to Publons. You may opt out of the service at any time.*

Wiley is committed to ensuring integrity in the peer review process. Publons tracks, verifies and showcases peer review activity without compromising reviewer anonymity or infringing upon *JPIM*'s policies, as specified in Wiley's review confidentiality policy.

By default, the content of *JPIM* reviews will not be publicly displayed on Publons, and only the year of the review and the journal title will be shown on reviewer profiles, unless both the journal and reviewer has actively selected an alternative setting. This means that review comments remain confidential, unless permission is granted by the *JPIM* and, in some cases, the author as well. You may edit what is displayed for any review according to *JPIM*'s privacy settings or opt out of the service at any time.

Receive Credit for Past Reviews

Take a look at [Publons' instructions](#) for how to request credit via Publons for past review activity.