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As I write this, I am finishing my third year as Editor of Marketing Science and entering the final year of my term. The fun part of the job has been the constant challenge of finding a solution to all sorts of problems, including what manuscripts to accept and when, how to get the journal out in a timely fashion, and what direction the journal should take. Perhaps the most gratifying part, however, has been the chance to work closely with many very talented people, especially Cindi Privitera, who has done a fantastic job as Business Manager; the current and past Area Editors; and Patricia Shaffer at INFORMS. Although I know I've made mistakes, hopefully most of the decisions I have made are positive and have left the journal in good condition.

Current Status
Largely through Cindi’s efforts, we reduced our average turnaround to 72 days for the first 10 months of 2000, the last point at which we tabulated turnaround. Thus, Marketing Science continues to provide a turnaround that is very competitive with that of other journals in our field. If only we could eliminate the last few outliers, we would fare even better. Although a solution to this problem is elusive because the long cycles are usually a result of illness or other unpredictable circumstances, we will continue to work on this problem. Sometimes, unanticipated reviewer defaults leave us in a predicament of either having both a long turnaround and one review or needing to lengthen the process further by seeking another reviewer at a late date. I very much prefer that reviewers state up front that they are unavailable or return manuscripts at the beginning, if they have any doubt about their ability to do a review, rather than have reviewers default at the end of a long process.

In 1998 we had 112 new submissions for regular issues, and last year we had 107. So far this year, we have had 113 submissions through the first 10.5 months, so we are well ahead of the rate of submission at a comparable date last year. Because the number and timing of submissions appear to have a large stochastic component, I am not sure how to interpret this year’s increase. Perhaps I should turn the data over to one of our experts in time series analysis. Pending this, the most reasonable conclusion is that annual submissions to Marketing Science have been stable for some time, in the range of 105–120 manuscripts annually.

There have been a number of changes to the Editorial Board since my last editorial. As noted in my last editorial, Wagner Kamakura became Editor of the Journal of Marketing Research, so he had to be replaced as Area Editor. Michel Wedel replaced Wagner last summer and has continued to provide very high-quality work. In addition, to lessen the workload on Area Editors who specialize in theoretical manuscripts, Jim Hess has been added as a new Area Editor. To reward a sizable number of people who had been providing quality reviews for Marketing Science for some time (in many cases they handled a heavier workload than most board members), nine people were added to the board this past summer. They are Barry Bayus, Rabikar Chatterjee, Anne Coughlan, Fred Feinberg, Peter Lenk, William Putsis, Gary Russell, Miklos Sarvary, and Gerard Tellis. Several others who do excellent reviews are good candidates for addition to the board in the near future.

Welcome news is that JSTOR has recently agreed to include Marketing Science as one of the journals included in its library of back issues (Management Science, Operations Research, and Organization Science will be there as well). Not only will this make it easier for members of the marketing community to access back