Reporting results of statistical analyses

SMJ no longer accepts papers for publication that report or refer to cutoff levels of statistical significance (p-values). In statistical studies, authors should report either standard errors or exact p-values (without asterisks) or both and should interpret these values appropriately in the text. Rather than referring to specific cutoff points, the discussion could report confidence intervals, explain the standard errors and/or the probability of observing the results in the particular sample, and assess the implications for the research questions or hypotheses tested.

For papers accepted for publication, SMJ requires that authors explicitly discuss and interpret effect sizes of relevant estimated coefficients.

The SMJ editorial on "**Creating Repeatable Cumulative Knowledge in Strategic Management**" provides a more detailed explanation of these policies.

Replication studies and studies that report "non-results"

SMJ publishes and welcomes submissions of replication studies. SMJ's goal in publishing replications is to provide additional evidence that helps build a cumulative body of knowledge in strategic management, not to overturn prior results. SMJ is interested in replications that accord with prior findings as well as those that do not.

For more information, please read the following editorials: **https://doi.org/10.1002/SMJ.2581** and **https://doi.org/10.1002/SMJ.2477**.

Replication Reviewer Guidelines, which explain how SMJ evaluates replication studies, are available **here**.

SMJ publishes and welcomes submissions of studies with non-results. These types of studies demonstrate a lack of statistical support in a particular sample for specific hypotheses or research propositions. Such hypotheses or propositions should be straightforward and logical. Studies should be conducted rigorously and assess the robustness of the non-results, such as robustness to alternative measurement, statistical specifications, and estimation methodologies.

Articles on datasets

SMJ is now open to publishing peer-reviewed articles on datasets. For dataset articles, SMJ is interested in datasets that are likely to attract significant interest from researchers, who can then exploit the data in a substantially broader fashion than was possible prior to publication.

For more information, please read the following editorials: **https://doi.org/10.1002/SMJ.2690** and **https://doi.org/10.1002/SMJ.3000**.

Causal inference

SMJ strongly supports research that seeks to address interesting and important questions in strategic management that involve complicated causal processes. SMJ recognizes that statistical analyses relevant to these questions may raise the issue of endogeneity. If relevant, authors should acknowledge this issue in submitted manuscripts and make a good faith effort to address it. In some cases, causal inference may be impossible, but statistical correlations, especially if used to rule out some alternative hypotheses or mechanisms, may still be of interest. The SMJ editorial on "**Quantitative Empirical Analysis in Strategic Management**" provides a more detailed explanation.

Data snooping and p-hacking

SMJ strongly disapproves of data snooping and p-hacking practices in empirical research. Authors of submitted papers should not search databases for statistically significant coefficients with the intention of subsequently formulating hypotheses that fit the significant coefficients. Authors also should not adapt experimental designs with the primary intention of producing statistically significant results. In addition, authors of submitted papers should address the material significance (magnitude) of the results, in addition to statistical significance.