

Brazilian Business Review Annual Editor Report 2018

Fabio Motoki – Editor-in-Chief – FUCAPE Business School

INTRODUCTION

This is the first Annual Editor Report from Brazilian Business Review (BBR). It has been a great year for the journal, with several important achievements. It has been my pleasure to announce so many positive news, and I am very grateful for the opportunity granted to me by BBR's Board of Directors to serve the academic community in this position. I hope this document initiates a BBR tradition, providing the community with useful information about the journal. Enjoy the reading!

EDITORIAL PROCESS

BBR's foremost challenge is to attract and publish high-quality academic research in business. As a generalist journal, BBR has a team of associate editors that covers a broad spectrum of the business area. The current team is a mix of very experienced researchers, recognized as references in their areas, and younger professors who have shown a distinguished capacity of conducting high-quality research. This highly qualified editorial board has complete freedom to decide the fate of their assigned manuscripts and is capable of curating contents of great interest to the academic community. The results of this strategy are twofold: BBR is one of the most respected and accessed journals in the area in Brazil, and, consequently, authors consider it a potential channel for their high-quality research.

BBR also has a policy of rotating its editors, including the Editor-in-Chief (EIC). The EIC has a two-year term, after which he becomes a co-editor. This policy ensures that the journal has a smooth transition, preventing the loss of knowledge and any structural breaks on its processes. Associate editors (AEs) are also rotated, refreshing the editorial board and opening space for rising researchers from time to time. Although this renewal process has its costs, its benefits are worth it. The main benefit is that it brings a fresh mindset, opening the journal to new ideas and different intellectual viewpoints.

Recently BBR has allowed authors to suggest potential reviewers to be assigned to their manuscript. There is also an option to recommend the exclusion of potentially conflicted reviewers. It is an attempt to provide the authors with a fair evaluation of their research by qualified experts on the theme. Even if the suggestions are not accepted, it helps the AE in selecting qualified reviewers for the paper.

In 2018 (until Dec 7th) BBR has received 198 new submissions, and 63 resubmissions from a “Review & resubmit” (R&R) decision by an AE, totaling 261 manuscripts. Of the 198 new submissions, 140 (>70%) have been rejected, showing the journal’s commitment to selecting high-quality research. The remaining 58 have either been accepted or are still in process (no final decision – accept or reject – has been made by the AE).

Table 1 breaks down the total of 270 manuscript decision letters sent in 2018. The great majority of submissions were rejected on the first round. The most common reason for rejection is a failure of the manuscript in showing a proper contribution to the literature. According to Grant & Pollock (2011), three essential questions must be answered to show the contribution: (1) Who cares? (2) What do we know, what we don’t know, and so what?, and (3) What do we learn?. Clearly answering these questions in your submitted manuscript will increase your chances of being considered for publication in BBR. The second most common reason for rejection is poorly written text. Poor text is a signaling that the research probably is low quality, as the authors have not given proper attention to their only channel of communication with the evaluators (EIC, AE, reviewers). A poor text may destroy the chance of good research being published, as the evaluators may fail to understand the manuscript’s contents. A carefully crafted text (either in English or Portuguese) indicates a potentially well-conducted research and facilitates the job of the evaluators, thus increasing the chances of your manuscript advancing in the editorial process.

Table 1. Manuscript decisions - 2018.

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|
| First-Round Outcomes | 207 | |
| Accept | 0 | 0% |
| Revise & Resubmit | 52 | 25% |
| Reject | 155 | 75% |
| Second-Round Outcomes | 46 | |
| Accept | 24 | 52% |
| Revise & Resubmit | 19 | 41% |
| Reject | 3 | 7% |
| Third and Later-Round Outcomes | 17 | |
| Accept | 13 | 76% |
| Revise & Resubmit | 4 | 24% |
| Reject | 0 | 0% |

About $\frac{1}{4}$ of the submissions made it through the first round, passing the desk review from both the EIC and AE, and getting an R&R decision by the AE. After addressing the issues detected by the reviewers and the AE, the authors resubmit their manuscript and initiate the second round. About half of the manuscripts fulfilled the requirements for publication at this stage and were accepted. A small minority got rejected at this point, due to unsatisfactory evolution of the manuscript, or due to not complying with the resubmission deadline. The remaining made it to the third and further rounds. At this point, more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of the resubmissions were accepted, with the remaining getting a new R&R decision.

For BBR, “unsatisfactory evolution” means that authors have failed in properly addressing all (or at least, most) of the issues brought up by the AE and reviewers. It is very important that authors carefully consider each issue and formulate an appropriate response. The response may be an acknowledgment that the authors agree with the issue and have

BBR taken appropriate measures to resolve it, or that the authors do not agree with it, and show scientific evidence to maintain their stance. The response letter in an R&R must clearly state each of the issues and their corresponding responses. Your R&R package should also contain a version of the manuscript clearly indicating the modifications made and the clean “final” version. These details greatly help the evaluators and speed up the decision process.

3

PROCESSING TIMES

BBR strives for running the editorial process as smoothly as possible, and has a dedicated Editorial Assistant to conduct the administrative aspects of the journal. In this year’s “Meet the Editors” session at EnANPAD all present editors expressed that one of the great challenges is sticking to the deadlines while providing high-quality evaluation to the authors and high-quality research to the readers.

The adoption of ScholarOne by the end of 2017 has greatly improved the monitoring of the process from submission to approval. Additionally, BBR’s EAs actively use ScholarOne’s scoring system for evaluating reviewers on the quality and timeliness of their work. Consistently bad evaluations may drive a reviewer out of the journal’s pool. Finally, the system automatically sends deadline reminders to editors and reviewers, helping our Editorial Assistant and me in keeping the process running.

BBR’s average time between submission and acceptance is at around 160 days. Considering that a flawless first round takes more than 100 days from first submission to R&R, and that almost half of second-rounders proceed to a third or later round, this figure shows that BBR’s processing times are within the expected parameters. It is a demonstration of respect for the submitting authors, who kindly choose BBR as the channel to divulge their research.

BBR’S REACH

In 2018 BBR has been accepted for inclusion in Scopus, one of the world’s most respected sources for academic research. The Scopus team has already begun BBR’s indexing process, and it should be finished in the first quarter of 2019. In this fashion, next year BBR will have an official SJR (SCImago Journal Rank) number. In 2019 BBR will also submit its request for inclusion into the Web of Science database, aligned with the internationalization strategy of the journal.

Redalyc provides some useful insight into BBR’s reach. Using Redalyc data from Business Administration & Accounting journals from Brazil ranked as A2 by the Brazilian Ministry of Education (the same rank as BBR), we obtain the graph of Figure 1.

BBR has the most article downloads, more than 136,000. Its level of internationalization (lower is better) is in line with most Brazilian periodicals of the A2 stratum, being less international than BAR (Brazilian Administration Review), RBGN (Review of Business Management), and RAE (Journal of Business Management) only. In common, these three journals have been indexed in Scopus for years, with two of them (RAE and RBGN) also indexed in Web of Science, having a higher visibility to an international audience than BBR.

Google Analytics is another way to measure BBR’s reach. Since the new website went live, in Jul/2018, there have been more than 9,500 distinct users accessing BBR, with more than 50,000 page views from 107 different countries. Excluding Brazil, the US, India and Portugal are the countries with most users as shown in Figure 2. Overall, these numbers highlight the importance of BBR being a bilingual journal, expanding its reach far beyond Portuguese-speaking countries.




Figure 1. Selected Redalyc stats on Brazilian journals.

Notes: BBR is Brazilian Business Review. BAR is Brazilian Administration Review. RAC is Journal of Contemporary Administration. RAE is Journal of Business Management. RBGN is Review of Business Management. RCF is Accounting & Finance Review. RAP is Brazilian Journal of Public Administration. RCO is Journal of Accounting and Organizations. O&S is Organizações & Sociedade. Intl. Index is a conversion to a decimal scale from 0 (most international) to 24 (least international) of the two-tier classification of Redalyc. Each level goes from 1 to 5 (1 is more international) and measures the diversity of authors' nationalities and how important is the participation of international authors in the journal's published articles (Redalyc, n.d.). For instance, BBR's classification is 35, which translates into 14 in the graph. Countries is the number of distinct authors' countries who have published. Downloads is the number of downloads (in tens of thousands, secondary right-hand axis) recorded in Redalyc. CV&R (Contabilidade Vista & Revista), RCC (Revista Contemporânea de Contabilidade) and RUC (Journal of Accounting) have been dropped due to lack of data in Redalyc.




Figure 2. Google Analytics statistics for BBR users, excluding Brazil.

BBR's success would not be possible without the help of literally hundreds of people. I begin by thanking Patricia, our Editorial Assistant. Without her professionalism, surely BBR would not function as well as it does. She also played a major role in the site's migration, an arduous and monotonous task, and completed this assignment with honors. I must also thank my predecessors, especially Dr. Bruno Felix and Dr. Emerson Mainardes, for handing me a well-oiled machine and for their continued support.

Our Associate Editors deserve much of the credit for BBR's great review process. All of them do their best to meet their deadlines and find good reviewers. They have spent several hours of their precious time and have lent all their expertise to serve this journal, partnering with authors to deliver a great final product: the research published by BBR. Their dedication and knowledge are the pillars of BBR, driving our quality control and helping to direct authors on improving their research.

A journal would be nothing without good articles. BBR owes a lot to all of you who have chosen this journal as the outlet for your research. We are honored by your choice, a sign of your trust in us, and a recognition of BBR as a solid journal in the area. We are also deeply indebted to our reviewers, who continuously donate us their precious time and knowledge to evaluate BBR's submissions. A roster with all our 2018 reviewers follows in Appendix A.

We are also grateful to our Supporting Institution, FUCAPE Business School, and CNPq, for providing the financial resources needed by BBR. In particular, the migration to the new website would not have been possible without their financial help. Last, but not least, I thank my wife Patricia (*not* our Editorial Assistant, it is another Patricia!) for her support and understanding.

REFERENCES

- Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ - Part 3: Setting the Hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873–879. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.4000>
- Redalyc. ([s.d.]). Metodología. Recuperado 24 de dezembro de 2018, de https://www.redalyc.org/redalyc/media/redalyc_n/acerca-de/metodologia/formulas.html

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Afonso Vieira, Valter | Ferreira, João | Munck, Luciano |
| Aguiar, Marcelo | Ferreira, Manuel | Nakao, Silvio |
| Alves, Helena | Fortunato, Graziela | Neto, Silvio |
| Arellano Rodríguez, Juan | Franco, Mário | Nunes, Alcina |
| Ayup, Jannett | Freitas, Flávia | Oliveira, Hallysson |
| Basso, Kenny | Freitas, Jorge | Oliveira, Lucia |
| Bastos, Poliano | Furquim, Nelson | Oliveira, Murilo |
| Bergmann, Daniel | Furtado, Liliane | Oyadomari, José |
| Bezerra Filho, Joao | Gomes, Adalmir | Paço, Arminda |
| Bido, Diógenes | Gonçalves, Miguel | Paniago, Robson |
| Bispo, Marcelo | Gosling, Marlusa | Paulo, Edilson |
| Bitti, Eugenio | Grugel, Daiane | Pelucio, Marta |
| Bon, Ana | Guarnieri, Patrícia | Petroll, Martin |
| Borges, Gustavo | Ingram, Darren | Pinheiro, Paulo |
| Braga, Ana | Iquiapaza, Robert | Pinto, Vera Regina Ramos |
| Bressan, Aureliano | Jucá, Michele | Pinto, Marcelo |
| Brito, Renata | Júnior, Fernando | Pontes Girão, Luiz Felipe |
| Brunhara, Aldo | Klann, Roberto | Ramos, Felipe |
| Caldas, Olavo | Lacruz, Adonai | Ribeiro, Gutemberg |
| Capelletto, Lucio | Ladero , Maria | Rocha, Saulo |
| Carvalho, Rodrigo | Lasso, Sarah | Rodrigues, Ricardo |
| Casalecchi, Alessandro | Laurett, Rozélia | Russo, Rosaria |
| Castro, Jose | Lavarda, Rosalia | Sarsur, Amyra |
| Chimenti, Paula | Leite, Ramon | Semprebon, Elder |
| Clemente, Ademir | Lopes, Evandro | Silva, Alfredo |
| Coelho, Antonio | Luisa, Mariana | Silva, Hermes |
| Costa, Cristiano | Macedo, João Marcelo | Silva, José Marcos |
| Crisóstomo, Vicente | Machado, Diego | Slomski, Vilma |
| d'Angelo, Marcia | Madeira, Maria | Souza, Ariana |
| Damasceno, Felipe | Mansur, Juliana | Tardin, Neyla |
| Dantas, José | Marques, Carla | Teixeira, Arilda |
| Davila, Guillermo | Martinez, Antonio | Toledo, Luciano |
| de Sousa, Josiano | Martins, Orleans | Tristão, José |
| De Toni, Deonir | Martins, Vinicius | Tureta, César |
| Duarte Júnior, Antonio | Matui, Paulo | Uriona, Mauricio |
| Dumer, Miguel | Medeiros, Otavio | Varvakis, Gregorio |
| Evangelhista, João | Miragaia, Dina | Vasconcelos, Katia |
| Fantinel, Letícia | Modenesi, Daniel | Vianna Brugni, Talles |
| Faria, Ana | Monte-Mor, Danilo | Vieira, Elsa |
| Farias, Josivania | Mota, Renato | Zabdiele, Márcia |
| Farias, Milton | Motoki, Fabio Y | Zambelli, Amanda |
| Farias, Salomao | Moura, André | Zanoteli, Eduardo |
| Ferreira, Bruno | | |