

Editorial philosophy

Mission

The mission of the Journal of Operations Management (*JOM*) is to publish original, high quality, operations management (OM) empirical research that will have a significant impact on OM theory and practice. Regular articles accepted for publication in the *JOM* must have clear implications for operations managers based on one or more of a variety of rigorous research methodologies. The *JOM* also publishes notes dealing with technical and methodological issues as well as insightful meta-analyses of the OM literature, comments on past articles, studies concerning the OM field itself, and other such matters relevant to OM. Manuscripts accepted for publication meet the following criteria:

- 1) Cross-functional and cross-enterprise decision-making,
- 2) Research rigor applied through the scientific theory-building approach,
- 3) Managerial relevance.

Policies

The *JOM*'s distinctive emphasis is on the management of operations. Accordingly, the aim of the *JOM* is to enhance the field of operations management and develop generalizable theory, typically through the identification, analysis, and resolution of real OM problems. *JOM*'s primary audience includes researchers interested in advancing the field as well as educators and practitioners who wish to keep abreast of the state of the art in OM research. The *JOM* seeks research that can help the audience develop a better conceptual base for understanding OM. The focus of articles for the *JOM* should be on the managerial

situation or the theory being studied rather than the solution techniques being developed or used. Highest priority is thus given to studies that are anchored in the real world and build, extend or test generalizable theories or frameworks of managerial significance. Most often such studies result from either identifying an actual, new managerial situation for which existing theory is inadequate – thereby resulting in an addition to theory – or else testing multiple existing theories against actual managerial situations to determine their relevance – thereby enhancing theory through subtraction.

Presentation

Papers that address particular managerial problems should be framed in terms of a real-world management situation that they have personal experience with (e.g., J. Heineke (1995). “Strategic operations management decisions and professional performance of U.S. HMOs”, *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 255–272). The description of this problem should appear in the introductory section of the paper.

If the paper uses simulation to address the situation, the simulation as well as the values of its parameters should reflect the managerial situation as closely as possible (e.g., K.J. Klassen and T.R. Rohleder (1996). “Scheduling outpatient appointments in a dynamic environment”, *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 83–101). The same is true for mathematical approaches (e.g., E. B. Fliedner and B. Lawrence (1995). “Forecasting system parent group formation: An empirical application of cluster analysis”, *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 119–130) but any complex mathematics

of the solution technique should go into an appendix. The literature review, other considerations of the solution approach, constraining factors, inapplicability of existing tools, generalizability of the problem, utility of the solution approach, and implementation / actual outcome aspects would constitute the main sections of the paper. Papers demonstrating real-world validation of the approach selected and its results are especially desirable.

Process

Submissions to the editorial office are first evaluated by the Editor-in-Chief for their appropriateness to the mission and objectives of *JOM*. If deemed appropriate, the paper is then sent out for review using a

double blind process. The first review of every manuscript is performed by three anonymous referees. In addition, the reviews for every paper submitted are reviewed by a member of the Associate Editor Board. The paper is then either accepted, rejected, or sent back to the author(s) for revision. Revised papers are then sent back to an Associate Editor who makes an evaluation of the acceptability of the revision. Based upon the Associate Editor's evaluation, the paper is then either accepted, rejected, or returned to the author(s) for another revision. The second revision is then evaluated by the Editor-in-Chief, possibly in consultation with the Associate Editor who handled the original paper and the first revision, for a usually final resolution. The editorial office strives to respond to all authors within three months for the first submission, two months for a revision and one month for a second revision.