


EDITORIAL

30th Journal of management and organization birthday: Valuable advice for management researchers

Vanessa Ratten¹ , Paul Hibbert², Eddy Ng^{3,4}, Shamika Almeida⁵, Niluka Jayaweera¹, Laurent Scaringella^{6,7}, Huong Nguyen¹, Alfred Presbitero⁸, Rajkush Kumar⁹, Giulio Ferrigno¹⁰, Hugo Pinto^{11,12} and Bichen Guan¹

¹Department of Management and Marketing, La Trobe University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; ²University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK; ³Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada; ⁴James Cook University, Singapore; ⁵School of Business, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, Australia; ⁶Rennes School of Business 2 Rue Robert D'Arbrissel, 35065 Rennes, France; ⁷Kozminski University Jagiellońska 57, 03-301 Warszawa, Poland; ⁸Deakin University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; ⁹Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, India; ¹⁰Department L'EMbeDS, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy; ¹¹University of Algarve, Algarve, Portugal and ¹²University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

Corresponding author: Vanessa Ratten; Email: v.ratten@latrobe.edu.au

(Received 11 December 2025; revised 11 December 2025; accepted 12 December 2025)

Abstract

As part of the Journal of Management and Organization's 30th birthday celebration it is important to reflect and consider what is valuable advice. This perspective article is coauthored by a number of academics and brings together their thoughts about value in management practice. An international array of management teachers and researchers provide their advice in the hope of inspiring future generations of management researchers.

Keywords: business; Management; research

Introduction

As part of the 30th birthday celebrations, it is important to consider key questions and practices regarding management research. This includes thinking about how to choose the right journal for the work that has taken much time to compile and should be published in the appropriate outlet. As there are so many journals particularly publishing business research it can be difficult to find the right journal for your work. This means it is important to get feedback from others about the processes they go through in terms of choosing a journal.

Once an article has been submitted and hopefully reviewer comments received, then it is important to process with consideration the feedback received. As research is often a subjective as well as objective process, it can be difficult to do this in an appropriate manner. This means it is useful to read about others experiences and suggestions as to how they handle reviewer comments. This can build resilience and intelligence about appropriate ways to handle feedback.

As a management researcher, it can be an arduous process in terms of keeping up to date with developments. This means it is useful to learn from others about general advice based on experience. Each person has a different journey, unique to them, so it is useful for them to tell their stories. This provides suggestions about what to do and how to approach the process of research. The next

section states the three questions related to valuable advice to management researchers, with each person's comments and response provided.

1. How should management researchers choose the right journal for their work?

Vanessa Ratten

This depends on the topic the management researchers are working on and what kind of career they want in the future. Usually, researchers want to publish in the journal that is discussing their topic and can make the most impact in terms of others reading their work. This means the journal has an ongoing conversation about specific topics and is considered as the leading authority in the field.

Paul Hibbert

Wherever you are seeking to share your work, there are three key things to think about. The number one priority is finding the conversation that you are seeking to join. Where are scholars already sharing insights on the theories, phenomena, or practical issues that you are concerned with? It is tempting to seek out a 'high status journal' that gives kudos in your field or helps you meet your institution's promotion criteria in obvious ways – but that is not going to work if you don't connect with the work already published there. Instead, look at the journals you have been reading and citing the most. Your reference list may give you a clue about the connections you have already made – these should be the journals on your short list. The second thing to think about is whether the journals on that short list are going to be sympathetic to your methodology. Many of the best journals are open-minded, accepting any method that is executed to high standards. But others are much narrower in their understandings, so check the journal's website for key guidance – and also try to locate articles in the journal that use a similar approach to you. That will give you some assurance of fit, and help you to see how to arrange and present your work in ways that the journal expects. The final item to place on your checklist is a pragmatic one – are there choices that fit better with your institution's assessment or promotion criteria? It is important to recognize how this may constrain you, but I still encourage you to consider the other two points first.

Eddy Ng

Find your people! I would encourage researchers to first find an academic home for their research topic. Located within academic homes are journals where you can find an audience who are interested in your research, will read, use, and cite your work. You are more likely to find reviewers who understand your work and can offer you helpful feedback. Some journals are more general in nature, and some have a regional or geographical focus. Find out if there were other previous papers (or special issues) published in these outlets for your topic. Look up the editorial team and the editorial review board members. Do not be afraid to ask for a particular individual to act as your action editor; that editor will have the expertise and network to find the right reviewers for you. In addition, you should also consider the journal's profile – is it well-received by your institution or colleagues, even if it is not an FT 50. Ask your colleagues and mentors for their perceptions and advice. Look up the journal metrics (e.g., impact factors), editorial team members, and who else publishes in the journal. Ideally, you want to join a group of scholars who publish relevant and scientifically rigorous work. If you are on a tenure clock, look up the average peer review time (or ask the editor if this is not made public). Finally, consider whether the journal actively promotes or supports knowledge mobilization following the acceptance of your paper. Find out if previously published articles have been cited in policy documents, served as authoritative scientific evidence in legal proceedings, or written up as translational articles such as those in *Harvard Business Review* or *The Conversation*. Such pathways can significantly extend the reach of your research, engaging a wider audience and amplifying the impact of your work.

Shamika Almeida

I ask myself four of the following questions before considering a journal:

- **Audience:** Who is the target audience for the research topic? Who would be keen to read the research findings? Will this research be of interest to the journal audience?
- **Impact:** How do I want to influence the disciplinary knowledge? Which journals are best suited to build on the existing knowledge around the given topic area?
- **Reputation:** Compare the metrics of the journal, reputation, and standing, and how the journal metrics align with the university's quality expectations and standards.
- **Fit:** Does the paper fit within the scope of the journal's aims? Have there been other papers in the journal around the topic of the article? Do the methods used in the paper fit the audience and the journal? Is the writing style aligned with the journal?

Niluka Jayaweera

Selecting the right journal is a multifaceted scholarly judgement that shapes the eventual reach, credibility, and influence of management research. The process begins with a clear appraisal of the intellectual community the work seeks to engage. As Boxer (2023) notes, researchers are typically already familiar with the journals that publish studies similar to their own, and this familiarity provides an initial map of potential publication venues. However, journal selection cannot be reduced to replicating where comparable studies appear. Effective placement requires an assessment of the audience most likely to use the findings, whether a broad, generalist readership or a more specialized community that values contextual precision and methodological nuance. In some cases, interdisciplinary or cross-domain journals may also offer advantages, particularly when the research carries implications beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries, an issue Walton (2018) highlights when discussing the multiple communities that may find value in the same piece of work.

A second dimension of journal selection concerns the alignment between a manuscript and a journal's remit. Scope statements, author guidelines, and published exemplars provide important signals regarding the types of contributions a journal is prepared to consider. Boxer's (2023) observation that being out of scope remains one of the most common reasons for desk rejection underscores the importance of this evaluative step. The assessment of fit, however, extends beyond topical relevance and includes methodological orientation, philosophical assumptions, and expectations regarding novelty or practical application. Journals vary in the extent to which they privilege theoretical advancement, empirical rigour, technical soundness, or practitioner relevance; matching these implicit expectations materially increases the likelihood of receiving a constructive review.

A third consideration involves the structural characteristics of journals, which Jacob and Sahni (2022) describe in terms of metrics, reputation, readership, turnaround time, and publication model. Metrics such as impact factor, SCImago Journal Rank, and rejection rate can offer insight into a journal's competitiveness and influence, but these indicators should not dominate decision-making. Their value lies in signalling the intellectual ecosystem a manuscript will enter, rather than providing a hierarchy of worth. Similarly, publication models, including traditional subscription, hybrid, and open access, shape the accessibility and visibility of research. For authors seeking to maximize readership or comply with funder mandates, the availability and credibility of open-access pathways become particularly important.

Finally, all three papers foreground the need to evaluate journal trustworthiness. The proliferation of predatory publishers, as Walton (2018) warns, makes it essential to assess editorial transparency, peer-review integrity, indexing status, and adherence to ethical standards. Boxer (2023) reinforces this point by emphasizing the need for due diligence, particularly when new or unfamiliar journals appear to offer rapid publication. Credible journals provide clear information about their editorial board, review processes, and ethical commitments, and are indexed in recognized scholarly databases.

Taken together, these insights indicate that choosing the right journal requires careful consideration of audience, intellectual alignment, structural characteristics, and ethical integrity. Journal selection is not simply a matter of maximizing visibility or prestige, but of positioning research where it can be read, trusted, and used by the communities it seeks to influence. A deliberate and informed

approach enhances the effectiveness of scholarly communication and ensures that management research contributes meaningfully to the conversations that matter.

Laurent Scaringella

My first piece of advice is to write a manuscript for a specific journal rather than deciding where to submit the paper at the end of the writing process. Having one target journal in mind from the beginning will encourage management researchers to read and cite papers from that journal. When choosing the right journal, consider how your work will contribute to the dominant voices on a specific research topic. Certain journals ‘monopolize’ or host the core debates on particular theories or phenomena. If an author genuinely seeks to advance a debate, there is a need to target the journal where that discussion is actively taking place. Furthermore, management researchers must carefully examine recent papers in the target journal to ensure that their chosen methods are commonly used and understood by the journal’s readers and reviewers.

When choosing the right journal, the question of the ranking always comes up, such as ABS, FT50, and national lists. I advise using international lists to target journals that are equally valued and have an international reach. As with luxury goods, the value of academic journals should be consistent worldwide. Naturally, there is a tendency to aim high within such lists, especially when a ‘job market paper’ is key to applying for open positions. The right journal should be chosen based on three career factors: the prestige of the institution where the PhD was obtained, target schools for future employment, and time available for publication. If a researcher aspires to work at a top-tier research school, they should target high-ranked journals. In that case, I would advise doing a postdoc first to maximize your chances of succeeding on the tenure track. If your goal is a good school, perhaps start with lower-ranked journals and take a ladder approach. Generally, it is better to publish one A paper than two B papers, one B paper than two C papers, and so on. As with a company’s vision, a mix of dreams and realism is necessary. While all scholars dream of having papers in the FT50, not all papers have the potential to be published in such outlets. Therefore, it is necessary to set realistic targets for a given project based on the research design, results obtained, and magnitude of the contribution.

Huong Nguyen

Selecting the right journal is a strategic decision that shapes how our work is received and by whom. Management is an interdisciplinary field drawing on various disciplines such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, economics, and history. It is also a universal practice – management occurs across sectors, cultures, and organizational contexts – yet each context presents its own nuances. For this reason, researchers need to position their work clearly so that the intended journal recognizes the contribution being made.

My own experience illustrates this point. Early in my career, I researched higher education (HE) management and considered HE primarily as a field of study; therefore, I published in specialized HE journals such as *Studies in HE* and *HE*. When I transitioned into a business school, I realized my work needed to speak to broader management audiences across corporate, public sector, and nonprofit organizations. This required reframing HE not as the primary disciplinary field, but as one context within which management phenomena unfold. Repositioning the work in this way expanded the relevance of my research and increased the likelihood of acceptance in mainstream management outlets.

To choose the right journal, researchers should read the journal’s aims, scope, and recent publications carefully. Ask: Has this journal published work on my topic? What are the dominant theoretical conversations? Who am I speaking to, and what can I add that is new, valuable, and relevant? Publishing is like joining an ongoing scholarly conversation: you need to know who is in the room, what has already been said, and how your work advances the discussion.

Alfred Presbitero

This is an important question which is particularly relevant for early career researchers (ECRs). There are so many journals out there, and ERCs can easily get lost in finding the right ‘home’ for their papers. So to navigate this complex process of choosing, it is a valuable exercise to ask senior researchers (or

other colleagues) who have published in that journal. They would have first-hand experiences on what the journal is all about (i.e., what are the topics of interest for the journal), and this would help ECRs in gauging whether there is 'fit'. Similarly, by asking other colleagues, they can get insights into the review process (i.e., how constructive, relevant, and timely the feedback is). Alternatively, reaching out directly to the Editors may be a good idea too (and hopefully the Editors are not too busy to reply).

Rajkhush Kumar

Selecting the right journal is less about a one-shot guess and more about an evolving alignment exercise. From my experience and from conversations with fellow early-career researchers, three practical approaches tend to work well:

Journals as part of the ideation process

Many researchers begin by shortlisting multiple journals early on. This helps them sense where conversations are happening, what theoretical debates matter, and what contribution threshold each journal expects. It also subconsciously shapes the paper's ambition level.

Narrowing the choices during conceptualization

Once the research question becomes clearer, the set of potential journals usually narrows. At this stage, authors assess the journal's audience, positioning, methodological openness, and prior publications on similar themes. This prevents misalignment later.

Final selection after the full paper takes shape

Often the most accurate journal choice emerges only when the study is substantially developed. Discussing the working manuscript with domain experts, senior scholars, or co-authors helps position it where the paper has the strongest conceptual 'fit'. Sometimes, the paper itself evolves in ways that make an initially targeted journal less suitable and another more promising.

Giulio Ferrigno

Learning how to find the right home for a manuscript is a skill I gained after many rejections. Over time, I realized that journals are not just paper repositories – they are ongoing conversations. Each journal favours distinct debates, theoretical framings, and methodological preferences. The literature we cite is often the clearest indicator of where our work belongs: it reveals which journals have shown interest in our topic and which communities we are implicitly talking to. High-impact journals, such as *Journal of Management and Organization*, care less about long reference lists and more about whether a paper advances a conversation. This matters even more today, in a landscape increasingly populated by manuscripts produced with generative AI tools but offering little genuine insight. We are going to an era where journals will inevitably increase the rejection of papers. To stand out, management researchers must engage with their target journal's debates, understand the questions that matter to those communities, and contribute meaningful knowledge. In other words, choosing a journal is an intellectual decision that requires management scholars to place themselves in ongoing scholarly dialogue within specific journals.

Hugo Pinto

The decision of selecting the appropriate journal for management research is rarely straightforward because of numerous interrelated factors. Researchers normally consider a journal's position in recognized international rankings, the reputation and scientific focus of its editorial board, connection with scientific and professional associations, and how well the journal helps them to reach academic and professional audiences. Other elements that matter include the publisher's visibility, search engine performance, time for first decision, and the presence of well-curated special issues, among others. However, the most meaningful criterion is arguably whether the journal is genuinely embedded in the scholarly community that inspires one's own work. When a journal is read by the authors you admire, it becomes a space in which you can engage in relevant epistemic debates, positioning your research alongside the thinkers who motivate your intellectual path.

Bichen Guan

Choosing the right journal is both a strategic and developmental decision for management researchers, requiring thoughtful consideration of the alignment between a journal's mission and scope and the manuscript's core contribution. A well-aligned journal with an audience that genuinely cares about the topic is far more valuable than aiming for a higher-ranked journal where the manuscript sits at the margins of relevance. The process begins with clarifying which scholarly conversation the manuscript seeks to join and what theoretical, empirical, methodological, or practice-oriented contribution it offers, followed by examining which journals typically publish work consistent with those contributions. Beyond reviewing journal missions and recent publications to understand scope and methodological preferences, researchers can make use of opportunities to meet editors at conferences and attend paper development workshops to gain deeper insights into specific journals' expectations. We also consider practical aspects, including typical review timelines, the journal's openness to different types of research, and the potential impact of publications. It is also helpful to talk with colleagues about their experiences with various journals, including the quality and developmental nature of the feedback, the timeliness of the review process, and the consistency of the decision-making process. Ultimately, selecting the right journal involves balancing strategic fit, practical realities, and professional insights to identify the venue where the manuscript will be best understood and most likely to make a meaningful contribution.

2. How can management researchers respond constructively to reviewer comments?

Vanessa Ratten

Writing and submitting a journal article can be a daunting task as it takes a lot of time and effort. This means when receiving reviewer comments, it brings a lot of emotions in terms of being close to submission but not yet being there yet. So to get an acceptance and to benefit from publishing an article, one must be conscientious about responding to reviewer comments. A good topic is when you get the reviewer comments is to read them, then give you some time before you respond. This enables some thinking about what the comments actually mean and how to respond to them. Ideally, you should try to wait one week before coming back to tackle the reviewer comments. If you are receiving a revise and resubmit, this is a good sign so there is a high likelihood that you revised article will be later accepted.

Paul Hibbert

Getting a revise and resubmit invitation from a journal is a real achievement – your chances of publication will have increased significantly – but it does not always feel like that! After endless honing and refinement *before* you submitted your paper, it can be depressing or infuriating (or both) to get demands for even more work. So the first step is to read the decision letter from the editor, give yourself some space to process the emotions (maybe a week or two), and then pick it up again. You should then be able to see the value of the comments that have been offered, even if you don't agree with all of them. If you are working with collaborators, you can help each other to decide what the useful points are and how to engage in the process. Or, if you are working alone, it can help to discuss your approach with a trusted colleague. Then engage with the revision process as if the reviewers were collaborating with you on the paper, and consider their advice with that frame of mind. That does not mean that you do everything that they suggest! You still know your work best, but keep an open mind – and make sure that you at least offer a response to every point that has been made. Think how you would feel if you offered suggestions to a friend on their work: you might find it perfectly OK if they took a different view, but you would be pretty upset if they ignored your comments without saying a word. The tone of your response matters too: reviewing is voluntary, unpaid work, so it is reasonable to express your gratitude to reviewers – even when their comments make you cross!

Eddy Ng

Pull up a chair! Besides stating the obvious (read and reread, be polite, thank the reviewers), consider R&Rs as an opportunity to have a conversation with your reviewers and your editor, even though you

do not get to meet them, or not yet! First, remember that they have been tasked to provide a critique of your work; their goal is to uphold the scientific tradition (e.g., is your research robust, rigorous, replicable) by asking questions and pointing out flaws. Your task is to address these criticisms either through revisions or convincing your reviewers and making the case that you are right in your rebuttal. If the feedback is unclear, approach your action editor for clarification or guidance. I frequently insert somewhere in my response document, *'if I misinterpreted your feedback, please let me know, and I will be happy to rectify this'*. Also, know that the reviewers were chosen because of their expertise, so they have something valuable to offer to enhance your paper. Many reviewers go above and beyond with suggestions or recommendations to assist with the revisions and/or help move your research forward. I have derived ideas from excellent reviewers, sometimes for a second paper. Since you and the reviewers are not able to directly communicate, know that you are reading each other through cues (emojis not recommended) in your response letter. Demonstrate a willingness to consider the reviewers' perspectives and to undertake additional analyses when requested. While you are not obligated to incorporate every suggestion, clearly and respectfully explain your rationale when deciding not to include certain revisions (you can footnote the additional work and thank the reviewer for their suggestions). Finally, think of writing your response letter as a conversation you have behind the curtains that may become public (newspaper test!). If your paper is accepted, your reviewers will know who you are.

Shamika Almeida

- **Co-constructed knowledge:** Consider reviewer comments as adding value to your arguments and as a process that ultimately helps generate more meaningful knowledge. Many of us look at the first versions of our papers and know that the reviewer comments, although painful at times, have helped create much more insightful and robust arguments and knowledge.
- **Take time to reflect:** Think of the revise-and-resubmit as a reflective process. Take a step-by-step approach. Read the comments and walk away from the paper for a week or so. Reflect on how and why you need to make the revisions. Step away, then plan when, who, and how to do the revisions. Use an approach that suits your style of working, whether it is a more structured approach that focuses on one comment at a time, or do all the revisions in one go. Think of it as polishing a diamond. It may take several attempts to get to the final product. You Do You!
- **Clarifications:** If reviewers ask you to do things outside the scope of the paper, or you have a strong rationale for not doing the revisions, clarify with the associate editor and rationalize why you think it is not useful to follow through with the feedback.
- **Respect and appreciation:** In the first instance, many of us tend to respond with anger when writing to reviewers, feeling they are asking us to make unnecessary revisions. Perhaps they missed things in your article; they are only human. Even if you feel the reviewers were disrespectful, you can still treat them with respect and appreciate their perspectives and suggestions. However, if you disagree, you can still respond respectfully to reviewers, using sound logic/justification for why you did not undertake the revisions based on their feedback.

Niluka Jayaweera

Responding constructively to reviewer comments is a central element of scholarly publishing and a key determinant of whether management research progresses through the editorial process. A useful starting point is to acknowledge the variability in reviewer behaviour. Picano's (2025) classification of reviewers into the good, the bad, and the ugly underscores this diversity: the 'good' reviewer offers balanced, evidence-based critique intended to strengthen the manuscript; the 'bad' reviewer may provide vague or poorly justified comments; and the 'ugly' reviewer can deliver blunt, even harsh assessments that nevertheless may contain valuable insights. Recognizing this heterogeneity allows authors to separate tone from substance and engage with the underlying intellectual issues rather than reacting emotionally to the style of delivery.

Managing the initial emotional response is also an important step. As Happell (2011) notes, disappointment or frustration is common, particularly when revisions are substantial, but stepping back before engaging with the feedback allows authors to approach comments with greater objectivity. Constructive engagement requires a systematic and transparent response strategy: copying each reviewer comment into a separate document, addressing points individually, and indicating clearly what changes have been made. This point-by-point approach signals respect for the reviewers' contribution and supports efficient editorial decision-making. Importantly, reviewers' opinions are not authoritative; where authors disagree, they may do so, provided they offer a clear, respectful, and well-reasoned justification.

Understanding how reviewer feedback functions linguistically further strengthen the revision process. Paltridge (2015) highlights that reviewer comments frequently employ polite or indirect phrasing, meaning that what appears as a gentle suggestion may, in practice, represent a required change for acceptance. Misinterpreting these linguistic cues can lead to incomplete revisions and additional review cycles. Effective authors recognize these conventions and respond in a way that aligns with the reviewer's underlying expectations.

A more complex challenge arises when reviewer comments reflect bias. Haffar *et al.* (2019) document numerous forms of peer-review bias, including institutional, national, language, and methodological biases, which can shape the nature of reviewer recommendations. Their analysis also shows that reviewers may request inappropriate adjustments, such as unnecessary post-hoc analyses, that risk introducing analytic distortion. Constructive response therefore, requires discernment: legitimate concerns should be addressed thoroughly, while requests that compromise methodological integrity should be declined with clear justification. This approach both protects research quality and signals the author's commitment to methodological rigor.

Transparency and integrity underpin all interactions with reviewers and editors. Wager and Kleinert (2021) emphasize that journals may seek clarification from authors even when a manuscript is ultimately rejected, particularly if concerns about data quality or research integrity arise. Authors are therefore expected to respond promptly, provide full explanations, and supply additional information when requested. This reinforces the principle that revision letters form part of the broader ethical landscape of scholarly communication, not merely a procedural exchange.

Taken together, these insights point to a consistent conclusion: responding constructively to reviewer comments requires clarity, organization, intellectual humility, and ethical responsibility. Authors who engage with critiques systematically, interpret reviewer intentions accurately, resist inappropriate suggestions with reasoned argumentation, and communicate in a measured and professional manner significantly increase the likelihood of a favourable editorial outcome. More importantly, they contribute to the collective aim of peer review to strengthen the quality and impact of published research. Constructive response is therefore not simply a means of securing publication; it is a fundamental expression of scholarly citizenship within the management research community.

Laurent Scaringella

As a management researcher, the reviewer should not be viewed as a friend or an enemy. Rather, the reviewer should be seen as someone with standards that must be met for publication in a given journal. Ultimately, reviewers do not accept a paper simply because they like it; rather, they accept it when there are no justifiable reasons to reject it. Responding constructively does not mean implementing every suggested change. I implement comments that genuinely help improve the paper regardless of the effort required, but I also provide a rebuttal in certain circumstances. This includes instances where a suggested change is not scientifically sound, would harm the paper's core reasoning, or if a reviewer suggests citing references solely for self-citation. I also don't want to spend my time responding to an AI-generated review either.

To respond constructively to the reviewers' comments, I suggest writing a detailed response letter that addresses each comment individually. The author's primary goal should be to minimize the effort the reviewers must make to evaluate the manuscript. Since researchers often play the dual

roles of author and reviewer, we should consider what bothers us most when reviewing. Personally, I find general, unspecific responses frustrating, such as ‘We enhanced the entire manuscript, which is now much more focused and provides a stronger contribution to theory’. Detailed comments require detailed responses. To achieve this clarity, I suggest a meticulous structure for addressing each comment individually. One effective pattern is to first copy the comment from the reviewer exactly, then provide a precise explanation of the change or reasoned rebuttal, and finally copy and paste the modified part of the manuscript directly into the letter. This three-part approach ensures maximum traceability and allows the reviewer to quickly verify compliance without searching the document. In some instances, comments from two reviewers may contradict each other, making it difficult to respond constructively. In such cases, I advise contacting the editor, who may help you resolve the discrepancy. Finally, in order to respond constructively to reviewers, it is necessary to respect the deadlines; otherwise, the reviewers will need to put in extra effort to review your paper again.

Huong Nguyen

Responding constructively to reviewer comments is an essential scholarly skill. Although receiving critical feedback can initially feel disheartening, I have found that reviewers’ insights almost always strengthen the quality and clarity of my work.

My process is systematic. I begin by copying all reviewer comments into a single document and colour-coding them: green for positive feedback, red for comments requiring major revisions, and yellow for minor changes. I then insert each comment into the relevant section of my manuscript, reread the paper alongside the embedded feedback, and develop a set of action items. I usually address smaller or more straightforward comments first to reduce the volume of revisions and ease the cognitive load. I then focus on the comments that are most central to the contribution of the paper – these often require the most work but also yield the greatest improvement and help address multiple reviewer concerns simultaneously.

I try to approach reviewer comments with gratitude. Reviewers volunteer their time to help us refine our arguments, clarify our methods, and strengthen our contributions. I treat their feedback as guidance on how to elevate the manuscript to the level required for publication. Even when I disagree, I acknowledge their perspective in my response letter and justify my decisions respectfully. This mindset transforms the revision process into a valuable learning experience rather than a source of frustration.

Alfred Presbitero

Reviews can come in different forms, shapes, and sizes. So my advice is to firstly read through the comments multiple times (and on several occasions). This process would help surface and crystallize, at least from the perspective of the author/s, what the reviewers are asking and seeking to address. If the comments are really framed negatively, we can always explain our perspective (and our rationale) for doing so, which hopefully can convince them to change their views. Again, it is all written correspondences, so we have to be very persuasive in our writing when responding to the comments of the reviewers.

Rajkhush Kumar

Reviewer comments, even when demanding or difficult, are an essential mechanism for scholarly growth. They should be approached with a mix of humility, discernment, and intellectual confidence.

A reviewer provides an expert third-person perspective.

Their distance from the project often helps reveal blind spots that authors and supervisors may miss. This outside-in perspective is invaluable for refining arguments.

Comments prompt a re-examination of core research elements.

Good reviewers push us to revisit conceptual framing, modelling choices, data decisions, and methodological rigor. Their questions often strengthen the paper far beyond the immediate revision cycle.

Balance responsiveness with intellectual independence.

Not every suggestion needs to be accepted uncritically. Reviewers, too, bring their worldviews, methodological preferences, and biases. Authors should thoughtfully engage with each comment and clearly justify their decisions either by revising the manuscript or by explaining why a particular change would compromise the paper's theoretical integrity or originality. The goal is to be collaborative, not compliant.

Giulio Ferrigno

The review process works only when we approach it with honesty and respect. I have learned that reviewers are far from being enemies; they are collaborators who, anonymously and generously, use their time to help us improve our works. No reviewer is ever entirely wrong. As such, management scholars should be grateful for each reviewer. They should also never try to 'play games' with reviewers' comments. When reviewers feel that authors claim to have done something they have not, or when authors answer selectively, reviewers' frustration rises quickly.

A practical way to manage the review process constructively is to show gratitude for the time reviewers and editors invest in helping authors to improve their work, break down each review into specific concerns, provide an exhaustive answer to each concern, and finally show how the manuscript changed as a result. When they cannot fully address a comment, they should explain why clearly but also offer an alternative that still strengthens their paper.

Hugo Pinto

A constructive approach to reviewer comments begins with understanding that reviewers volunteer their time to help improve others' work, often without compensation or recognition. This perspective makes their criticism easier to appreciate. However, not all comments can or should be accepted uncritically. Authors must interpret feedback with both humility and judgement. Sometimes, the appropriate response is to make extensive revisions; at other times, authors must carefully explain why certain suggestions would weaken the article's coherence, theoretical contribution, or narrative focus. The most fruitful approach is to balance gratitude for the reviewer's efforts with a thoughtful defence of the manuscript's core ideas. This involves honestly clarifying limitations while preserving the integrity of the research vision that is in the origin of the paper.

Bichen Guan

A key mindset in responding to reviewer feedback is to embrace comments with openness and curiosity, recognizing them as opportunities to strengthen the manuscript and further develop our research skills. Reading the reviews multiple times to go through the initial emotional reactions and then to fully and accurately understand the editor's and reviewers' concerns helps ensure a constructive approach. Engaging co-authors in interpreting feedback often leads to more balanced and thoughtful revisions, as multiple perspectives can reveal nuances that a single author might overlook. When addressing comments, it is important to respond to each comment in both the manuscript and the response letter. In the response letter, summarizing the major revisions at the beginning can help the review team quickly capture how the manuscript has evolved. Under each comment, clearly explaining your understanding of the concern or suggestion, describing the changes made, and clarifying how these changes improve the manuscript is essential. When certain suggestions cannot be implemented due to theoretical, methodological, or practical constraints, providing a clear and courteous justification reassures reviewers that their feedback has been carefully considered rather than dismissed. Tone also matters throughout the review process: expressing appreciation for reviewers' and editors' efforts fosters a collaborative atmosphere and helps maintain constructive communication with the review team.

3. What general advice would you give to management researchers based on your experience?

Vanessa Ratten

Enjoy your life is the best advice I can give. As a management researcher, it is an honor and a delight to be able to write and teach about management issues. So even though there may be some hiccups

along the way, overall the life of a management research is great. Therefore, as my mum use to say 'smell the roses'. That is to look at the positives and fun of life.

Paul Hibbert

There are four general points worth mentioning. First, think about who you are becoming and how you can be more reflexive about that. A scholarly life is (or should be) a reflexive journey of continued change and learning (Hibbert, 2026), and academic research should be formative – helping you and others to learn and grow – rather than extractive (Hibbert, 2025). So it is important to be choose your path – or make the path as you walk it, if you feel called to break new ground. Second, nothing is ever achieved solely by yourself –even if we have publications that are 'single authored', there is a community that helped to shape us and our work. For that reason, it is important to think about how you contribute to that community that academic scholarship and research all depend on, which we build and maintain together. So think about how you can engage in the mutually supportive relationships that help us all succeed in our work. That relational work could involve some or all of these activities: reviewing for journals; taking active roles in learned societies like ANZAM; or providing informal support for others in your network. Third, most of us have careers that involve teaching as well as research. Try not to see teaching as a distraction or a drain – you can make half your working life miserable by doing that, as well as missing out on the growth and joy that can come from teaching. As much as you can, find out the kind of teacher you are and find ways to teach that fit with your values and intellectual interests (Callagher & Hibbert, 2025). In that way, teaching can be energizing and a synergistic space for your scholarly development. The final piece of advice is simple: never make decisions based on just one person's advice (including mine!). Instead, take many soundings and make up your own mind.

Eddy Ng

Craft a scholar identity for yourself! Reflect on what motivates you, where does your expertise lie, and what kind of impact you aspire to make through your research. Consider how you would like your work to be described by others. When the media or the broader public seeks expert insight in your area of expertise, whose name comes to mind? A scholar identity is about creating cohesion and coherence so that your body of work tells a compelling story over time. It also acts like a research compass, helping you focus your research agenda and build cumulative knowledge rather than scattered outputs. This means strategically selecting journals, conferences, and professional networks that align with your scholarly interests and values. Be mindful that your scholar identity extends beyond journal articles, monographs, or book chapters. It should encompass how you engage with the public through media work (say no to requests that are outside your expertise), participate in professional service, mentor others, and contribute to knowledge mobilization. These activities collectively shape how we are perceived and remembered within the research community. Finally, as you progress through your academic career, use the platforms at your disposal (whether in the classroom, public speaking engagements, or scholarly publications) to advocate for meaningful social change and foster greater awareness of critical societal issues.

Shamika Almeida

- I entered academia late in life after many years in industry. I am passionate about generating knowledge that is meaningful and useful to organizations and the community, helping them strive to be better.
- **Meaningful research:** I engage in research based on real-world problems. Many of my research projects have been strongly influenced by my lived experiences, and I have sought to approach them with an open mind and ethical intent, aiming to make a positive contribution to organizations and the community.
- **Curiosity:** Be curious about the things that are happening, have happened, and could happen in the business world. Always be curious about whether there is a better way to do things in organizations and in research.

- **Flocks:** I flourish and generate more meaningful research when I collaborate with a team that uses our collective strengths.
- **Build capacity:** Ultimately, your legacy may depend on the people you have had a positive impact on in your lifetime. No one will remember you for the volume of research papers; rather, how you generated new knowledge, undertook meaningful research that adds value to our society, and how you built capacity in future generations, whether it is in your undergraduate and postgraduate students, HDR candidates, or your peers.

Niluka Jayaweera

Effective management research rests on a foundation of conceptual clarity, methodological rigour, and a sustained engagement with the scholarly conversations that define the field. Researchers benefit from developing well-defined constructs, transparent analytic procedures, and theoretically grounded arguments that speak directly to identified debates rather than operating in isolation. Reading widely and positioning one's work within, or deliberately against, existing conversations strengthens both relevance and contribution. Constructive engagement with critique is equally important. Peer review, formal or informal, should be viewed as an opportunity to refine ideas, clarify reasoning, and strengthen methodological choices. Approaching feedback with openness rather than defensiveness is a hallmark of mature scholarship. Ethical stewardship, honest reporting, careful data management, and respect for participants and collaborators remain integral to research credibility.

Finally, management research is best pursued as a long-term endeavour. Developing a coherent programme of inquiry, collaborating thoughtfully, and prioritizing depth over volume helps build work that endures. Attention to these principles not only improves individual research outputs but also contributes to the robustness and relevance of the field as a whole.

Laurent Scaringella

One important piece of advice is to maintain a robust research pipeline by having different manuscripts at various stages. Ideally, you would have a mix of a working paper, a paper under initial submission, and a paper undergoing a revise and resubmit (R&R). This strategy ensures continuity and mitigates the risk of project rejection without jeopardizing your career. However, you should avoid handling multiple R&R simultaneously, advice that I find difficult to follow. R&Rs are very demanding, and taking on too many at once often leads to co-author fatigue, delayed publication, and unnecessary mental strain. Each scholar must determine their limit on the number of projects they can reasonably take on because objectives, networks, and stress thresholds vary widely.

Management researchers must also determine the optimal number of co-authors. Some enjoy managing large-scale, multi-author projects as principal investigators, while others prefer a limited number of collaborators to facilitate quicker iterations and a more effective workflow. Setting clear roles and expectations for each co-author is needed for every collaboration. Similarly, being transparent about the order of authorship from the project's inception is key. Furthermore, keep in mind that the time frame and publishing pressure for a tenure-track assistant professor differ greatly from those of a full professor.

As the demand increases for management researchers to demonstrate real-world utility, I highly recommend dedicating your research efforts to addressing the challenges of our time. One concrete way to do so is to choose a specific United Nations Sustainable Development Goal to ensure your paper addresses a pressing global issue. In my case, whereas the study of high-tech start-ups was common 15 years ago, the study of agricultural SMEs in developing countries is now often more meaningful in terms of global impact. To truly close the loop, I encourage researchers to craft impact cases that go beyond publication. This involves communicating your results directly to policymakers, monitoring the decisions they make based on your findings, and finally, assessing the resulting impact on the economy, society, and the environment.

Huong Nguyen

At its core, management research aims to advance theoretical understanding while also offering insights that are meaningful for practice. Management is inherently applied: our work should help leaders, managers, and organizational actors make sense of complex environments and improve how they work. For this reason, I believe management researchers should continually reflect on how their findings might be used by end users – whether practitioners, policymakers, or educators.

Three pieces of advice have guided my own journey. First, stay curious and grounded in theory, but never lose sight of the real-world problems that motivate our research. Second, embrace feedback – from reviewers, colleagues, and collaborators – as an opportunity to refine our thinking. Finally, be patient with yourself. Developing an academic voice, building expertise, and contributing meaningfully to the field is a long-term process. Consistency, openness to learning, and a commitment to quality are what sustain a successful research career in management.

Alfred Presbitero

The management research field has truly advanced significantly over the decades. This is something to celebrate! But we should also continue to be critical about our contributions and think more broadly about the ‘impact’ of our research. So my advice (and this is more of a challenge) for management researchers is to think more deliberately about impact, particularly the difference that we can make in the lives of individuals, the effectiveness of our organizations, and betterment of our societies. These should be our guide for research (and should fuel us into the future!).

Rajkhush Kumar

Management research thrives because it is inherently multidisciplinary it draws from economics, psychology, sociology, technology, finance, policy, and design science. This diversity is a strength, but only if researchers intentionally embrace it.

Stay open to multiple perspectives early in the journey.

Different disciplines frame the same phenomenon in surprisingly different ways. Over-fixating on a single lens too early can limit creativity and weaken the ability to articulate a truly compelling research problem. Broad reading in the early phases helps develop a holistic understanding before narrowing down.

Aim for precision without losing the big picture.

Publishing requires tightly scoped research questions, clearly bounded constructs, and rigorous methods. However, the intellectual foundation behind that precision should come from a wide literature base that reveals the phenomenon’s complexity.

Protect your originality, but with discipline.

Each researcher has a unique cognitive lens shaped by their background, training, and lived experience. This is not a limitation; it’s a source of novel contributions. But originality should not turn into premature theorizing. Avoid committing to a personal interpretation too early and then searching the literature only to confirm it.

A useful strategy:

Treat ideas not as ‘my idea’ or ‘someone else’s idea’ but as possible explanations competing on the basis of evidence.

When we detach ourselves from ideas emotionally, we’re better able to evaluate them critically. This helps minimize personal bias and allows genuine novelty to emerge from the interplay of data, theory, and reflective thinking.

Giulio Ferrigno

If I had to distil what I have learned as author, reviewer, or editor, I would give not one but five advices. I would start with this: never work in isolation. Ask for feedback constantly – at conferences, in PDWs, during doctoral and early-career consortia, in online workshops, and through informal

conversations. Friendly reviews from colleagues, senior scholars, and even people outside your discipline can help illuminate aspects of your work you had never questioned. Don't be shy; talk about your research to many people. At least a few of them will give you feedback that reshapes your thinking. Accept it with humility. Each manuscript becomes stronger because many minds have engaged with it.

Collaboration is another pillar. As scholars, we must build our identity also through our networks and co-authorships. Each of these grows slowly, through curiosity, generosity, and perseverance. But the academic world is much smaller than we think. Be nice to everyone and choose well the right co-authors – people who complement your skills, help you to write, and whom you trust – makes the process smoother and more enjoyable.

When preparing a manuscript, I focus on coherence: one main theoretical frame is usually enough, and arguments should remain simple, focused, and necessary. I choose references strategically, ensuring that I engage with the central conversations of the field and especially of the journal I am targeting. Before submitting, I ask myself a brutal but essential question: *Is this necessary?* Anything superfluous becomes an open door for reviewers to critique.

This brings to another key aspect: the art of writing. Writing requires daily discipline. I try to write a modest amount every day – 500 words, even if imperfect – because writing is both an art and a craft that improves only through practice. I pay attention to rhythm, clarity, and precision: short sentences balanced with longer ones; active and vivid verbs; concrete nouns that anchor ideas; sections that guide the reader rather than divide space. I study the writing of scholars I admire and borrow one or two techniques at a time, slowly refining my style.

If I could offer just one last thought to a junior scholar reading this: keep going and being patient. Write, share, revise, learn. You are building something bigger than a paper – the work you do today plants seeds that will support you for years to come.

Hugo Pinto

A general advice for management researchers concerns the choice of topics. Choose a topic that feels genuinely meaningful to you, both in terms of its academic relevance and the broader social context in which the research could have an impact. When you work on an issue that you consider important for collective life – one that awakens your curiosity and sustains your enthusiasm – the process of inquiry becomes easier, more rewarding, and more resilient. Deeper enthusiasm fuels persistence during challenging periods, inspires creative study designs, and ultimately improves the dissemination of research results. This increases the potential impact of the contribution. Passion for the topic is not merely a personal preference; it is often the key ingredient that sustains a researcher throughout the long journey of transforming a draft idea into a published article.

Bichen Guan

One key piece of advice for management researchers is to select research questions that genuinely matter to the academic community, organizations, and society. We need to invest our time wisely on research questions, making a significant contribution in both theory and practice, rather than 'playing around' the variables with minor incremental contributions. Addressing the real-world challenges will help to narrow the gap between academic research and management practice, increasing the relevance and impact of management research work. Also, ensuring strong alignment between the conceptual framework and operationalizations is essential. Researchers should choose measurement scales not simply because they are widely used, but because they accurately reflect the underlying concepts or constructs, ensuring that the interpretation of research findings is meaningful and applicable to practice. As management researchers, we are inevitably influenced by digital and technological transformations. Embracing a growth mindset, using technology responsibly, and integrating classical management research methods with innovative approaches from other disciplines can further strengthen research quality, enhance creativity, and open new avenues for impactful and rigorous management research.

References

- Boxer, E. (2023). Submitting your manuscript: How do you choose the right journal? *Veterinary Record*, 193(12), 484–485. <https://doi.org/10.1002/vetr.3783>
- Callaghan, L., & Hibbert, P. (2025). Disrupting the status quo: Valuing management education-focused academic pathways in business schools. Presented to the ANZAM Conference, Geelong, Australia.
- Haffar, S., Bazerbachi, F., & Murad, M. H. (2019). Peer review bias: A critical review. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 94(4), 670–676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2018.09.004>
- Happell, B. (2011). Responding to reviewers' comments as part of writing for publication. *Nurse Researcher*, 18(4), 23–27. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2011.07.18.4.23.c8632>
- Hibbert, P. (2025). Formative, not extractive: How critically reflexive research makes a difference. *Management Learning*, 56(1), 107–114.
- Hibbert, P. (2026). *How to be a Reflexive Researcher* (Revised Second ed.). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Jacob, T. G., & Sahni, P. (2022). Publication models and how to choose the right journal. *Indian Journal of Rheumatology*, 17(2S), S314–S318. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0973-3698.364673>
- Paltridge, B. (2015). Referees' comments on submissions to peer-reviewed journals: When is a suggestion not a suggestion? *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(1), 106–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.818641>
- Picano, E. (2025). Who is a reviewer? The good, the bad, and the ugly phenotypes. *Exploration of Cardiology*, 3, 101248. <https://doi.org/10.37349/ec.2025.101248>
- Wager, E., & Kleinert, S. (2021). Cooperation & Liaison between Universities & Editors (CLUE): Recommendations on best practice. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 6(1), Article6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-021-00109-3>
- Walton, D. W. H. (2018). Helping you choose the right journal? *Antarctic Science*, 30(2), 81–81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954102018000032>

Cite this article: Ratten, V. *et al.* (2026). 30th Journal of management and organization birthday: Valuable advice for management researchers. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2025.10074>