

A Thanks to the Many Individuals Who Make Publication of *Marketing Science* Possible

Bold innovative research in marketing science continues at a record pace. Manuscript submissions to our eminent journal, *Marketing Science*, remain high.

As Panel 1 (new submissions), Panel 2 (all submissions), and Panel 3 (published articles) reveal, submissions, revisions, and acceptances are all at historically high levels. We project 2004 new manuscript submissions to be 70% higher than those of 2001 submissions.

As Panel 4 illustrates, producing a successful journal involves managing a multistage process involving a coordinated team effort and requiring diligent area editors, meticulous reviewers, and dedicated responsive authors. Panels 5 through 7 report the remarkable improvements in turnaround time made possible by the admirable efforts of the laudable *Marketing Science* review teams. As the panels indicate, these hardworking review teams have been able to maintain the outstanding quality of the journal while achieving remarkably tight deadlines. Certainly, every author sincerely appreciates constructive reviews delivered in a timely manner.

Panels 8 and 9 show the wide coverage of our journal. *Marketing Science* now processes well over 300 manuscripts per year with nearly 900 reviews by over 600 different reviewers. We also benefit from the admirable and fastidious effort of 78 different area editors and 4 acting actors.

Panel 10 shows our acceptance rate at different phases of the review process. The number of revisions is certainly declining, and the time-to-print is near our historic low. Authors can look forward to decisions that are both quick and careful, a minimum number of revisions, and a rapid copyediting assigned and reviewed by our first-rate production editor, Stephen Siegforth. It is impossible here to detail all of the much-appreciated efforts of all of the individuals who have provided reviews and area editor (guest and regular) reports. Panels 11 and 12 recognize just a few of our more than 57 area editors (guest and regular) and more than 600 reviewers (guest and regular).

Panel 11 recognizes a few of our most productive area editors (based on the number of reports written) and the speed of completion.

Panel 12 recognizes a few of our most productive reviewers (based on number of reports written) and speed of completion.

Finally, let us not forget to thank the authors. *Marketing Science* requires and gets outstanding manuscripts from many individuals. Panel 13, based on some very preliminary citation data, provides some of the most cited articles by year over the last three years. Of course, citations are just one measure of impact, and this panel only includes a very small number of the myriad articles that contribute to endowery *Marketing Science* with its coveted impact in numerous communities.

Thank you all for an outstanding job.

Journal Statistics

1. New *Marketing Science* Submissions by Year

Year	Number of new submissions
2000	124
2001	124
2002	185
2003	220
2004	210 (projected)

2. Submissions by Period

Time period	New manuscripts	Regular revisions	Special issue revisions	Total submissions
1/1/02-6/30/02	85	34	1	120
7/1/02-12/31/02	100	58	14	172
1/1/03-6/30/03	101	52	12	165
7/1/03-12/31/03	119	52	13	184
1/1/04-6/30/04	105	60	9	174

Editorial pages are not part of the regular *Marketing Science* page budget. We thank the INFORMS Society for Marketing Science for paying for all editorial pages. We also thank the Society for granting every page supplement requested by the current editor.

3. Published Articles by Period and by Type

Time period	Articles published	New submissions	Published articles as percent of submissions (%)
1/1/02–6/30/02	11	85	12.9
7/1/02–12/31/02	13	100	13.0
1/1/03–6/30/03	12	101	11.9
7/1/03–12/31/03	12	119	10.1
1/1/04–6/30/04	20	105	19.0

4. Steps in the Review Process

Step	Function
1	Initial review
2	Send to reviewers
3	With reviewers
4	Waiting for late reviewers
5	With AE
6	Process & editorial decision

Note. Not every manuscript goes through every step.

5. Average Time in Each Step (Days)

Time period/step	1	2	3	4	5	6
1/1/02–6/30/02	1.8	1.4	40.8	8.7	18.0	7.0
7/1/02–12/31/02	0.9	0.9	35.3	7.7	20.2	7.1
1/1/03–6/30/03	1.2	0.4	32.5	10.2	15.9	6.7
7/1/03–12/31/03	2.4	0.5	42.8	10.4	16.7	6.9
1/1/04–6/30/04	1.4	0.4	33.6	6.7	8.7	4.3

Note. Excludes 2005 special issue.

6. Average Turnaround for Reviewer and AE Time (Days)

Time period	Average time with individual reviewer (days)	Maximum time with individual reviewer (days)	Average time with AE (days)	Maximum time with AE (days)	Average time with editor + admin. (days)	Maximum time with editor + admin. (days)
1/1/02–6/30/02	34.6	88.0	18.0	90.0	7.0	19.0
7/1/02–12/31/02	33.5	83.0	20.2	98.0	7.1	27.0
1/1/03–6/30/03	32.7	89.0	15.9	86.0	6.7	21.0
7/1/03–12/31/03	35.9	82.0	16.7	107.0	6.9	44.0
1/1/04–6/30/04	29.7	82.0	8.7	41.0	4.3	17.0

Note. Excludes 2005 special issue.

7. Total Manuscript Processing Time (Days)

Time period	Average total turnaround	Maximum total turnaround
1/1/02–6/30/02	76.3	176.0
7/1/02–12/31/02	72.1	195.0
1/1/03–6/30/03	66.0	133.0
7/1/03–12/31/03	81.0 (median)	197.0
1/1/04–6/30/04	61.0 (median)	122.0

Note. Excludes 2005 special issue.

8. Number of Reviews and Editorial Decisions

Time period	Reviews received during period	Number of AE reports	Number of editorial decisions
1/1/02–6/30/02	247	126	136
7/1/02–12/31/02	386	163	162
1/1/03–6/30/03	448	166	165
7/1/03–12/31/03	447	171	171
1/1/04–6/30/04	338	105	101

Note. Excludes 2005 special issue (7/03–6/30).

9. Review Team Composition

Time period	Number of different scholars returning reviews	Number of different area editors used	Number of acting editors
1/1/02–6/30/04	604	78	4

Note. Excludes 2005 special issue (7/03–6/30).

10. Outcomes by Year of Submission

Decision	Number of manuscripts by submission year			
	2001* (%)	2002 (%)	2003 (%)	2004** (%)
Initial submission				
Desk reject	1.3	4.9	3.7	7.5
Information request	1.3	0.5	3.7	0.0
Rejected	58.4	65.4	66.7	62.5
Revise	39.0	28.6	23.7	22.5
Conditional	0.0	0.5	1.4	5.0
Accepted	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Withdrawn	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0
First revision				
Information request	36.8	1.9	5.5	0.0
Rejected	36.8	26.4	32.7	8.3
Revise	0.0	45.3	36.4	33.3
Conditional	26.3	22.6	14.5	41.7
Accepted	0.0	1.9	10.9	16.7
Withdrawn	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0
Second revision				
Rejected	0.0	7.7	7.3	0.0
Revise	22.2	15.4	24.4	0.0
Conditional	77.8	42.3	43.9	60.0
Accepted	0.0	34.6	24.4	40.0
Third revision				
Information request		0.0	3.7	0.0
Rejected		5.0	7.4	0.0
Revise		10.0	0.0	11.1
Conditional		25.0	33.3	55.6
Accepted		60.0	55.6	33.3
Fourth revision				
Revise		0.0	20.0	0.0
Conditional		14.3	20.0	12.5
Accepted		85.7	60.0	87.5
Fifth revision				
Accepted		100.0	100.0	100.0

* Current editor only.

** First 6 months only.

11. A Special Recognition for a Few of the Great Area Editors Out of More Than 78 Area Editors (1/1/03–6/1/04)

Rank	AEs ordered by number of reports completed	AEs ordered by best turnaround times	AEs ordered by best turnaround times (two or more reports)
1	Duncan I. Simester (31)	Birger Wernerfelt (1)	Dick R. Wittink (2)
2	Gary L. Lilien (28)	Dick R. Wittink (2)	Joel Huber (21)
3	Chakravarthi Narasimhan (23)	Jeff Inman (1)	Eugene Anderson (21)
4	Roland Rust (22)	Wagner Kamakura (1)	Roland Rust (22)
5	K. Sridhar Moorthy (22)	George S. Day (1)	J. Miguel Villas-Boas (10)
6	Arvind Rangaswamy (22)	Joel Huber (21)	Tülin Erdem (14)
7	Scott A. Neslin (22)	Eugene Anderson (21)	Eitan Muller (11)
8	Joel Huber (21)	John Hauser (1)	Greg M. Allenby (17)
9	Eugene Anderson (21)	Roland Rust (22)	Greg Shaffer (17)
10	Pradeep Chintagunta (21)	J. Miguel Villas-Boas (10)	Jehoshua Eliashberg (2)
11	Z. John Zhang (21)	Tülin Erdem (14)	Gary L. Lilien (28)
12	Michel Wedel (20)	Eitan Muller (11)	Pradeep Chintagunta (21)
13	Kannan Srinivasan (19)	Greg M. Allenby (17)	Charles Weinberg (4)
14	Greg M. Allenby (17)	Greg Shaffer (17)	K. Sridhar Moorthy (22)
15	Greg Shaffer (17)	Jehoshua Eliashberg (2)	Vithala C. Rao (2)
16	Tülin Erdem (14)	Gary L. Lilien (28)	Arvind Rangaswamy (22)
17	Eitan Muller (11)	Christophe Van Den Bulte (1)	Duncan I. Simester (31)

11. (cont'd.)

Rank	AEs ordered by number of reports completed	AEs ordered by best turnaround times	AEs ordered by best turnaround times (two or more reports)
18	J. Miguel Villas-Boas (10)	Pradeep Chintagunta (21)	Michel Wedel (20)
19	Ravi Dhar (9)	Anne Coughlan (1)	Dominique Hanssens (3)
20	Bill Boulding (7)	Bart Weitz (1)	Barbara E. Kahn (2)
21	James D. Hess (7)	Glen L. Urban (1)	Ambar Rao (2)
22	Charles Weinberg (4)	A. Parasuraman (1)	Peter Fader (3)
23	Terry Elrod (4)	Ashutosh Prasad (1)	Ravi Dhar (9)
24	Abel Jeuland (4)	Joel H. Steckel (1)	Terry Elrod (4)
25	Dominique Hanssens (3)	Charles Weinberg (4)	Kannan Srinivasan (19)
26	Peter Fader (3)	Douglas Bowman (1)	Z. John Zhang (21)
27	Robert J. Meyer (3)	Florian Zettelmeyer (1)	Robert J. Meyer (3)
28	Jinhong Xie (3)	Vicki G. Morwitz (1)	Scott A. Neslin (22)
29		K. Sridhar Moorthy (22)	Jinhong Xie (3)
30		Vithala C. Rao (2)	Chakravarthi Narasimhan (23)

Note. Number of reports is in parentheses.

12. Special Recognition for a Few of the Great Reviewers Out of More Than 600 Reviewers (1/1/03–6/1/04)

Rank	Reviewers listed by number of reports completed	Reviewers listed by best turnaround times	Reviewers listed by best turnaround times (three or more reports)	Reviewers listed by best turnaround times (five or more reports)
1	Preyas Desai (13)	Michael H. Rothkopf (1)	Koen Pauwels (4)	John Hauser (6)
2	Douglas Bowman (11)	Ye Hu (1)	Richard Briesch (3)	Christophe Van Den Bulte (9)
3	Yuxin Chen (11)	Micael Dahlen (1)	Arnaud De Bruyn (3)	William Putsis, Jr. (9)
4	Ganesh Iyer (11)	Koen Pauwels (4)	John Hauser (6)	Xavier Drèze (8)
5	Carl F. Mela (10)	Richard Briesch (3)	Christophe Van Den Bulte (9)	Eyal Biyalogorsky (5)
6	Christophe Van Den Bulte (9)	Amna Kirmani (1)	Olivier Toubia (3)	Abbie Griffin (5)
7	William Putsis, Jr. (9)	Fabian Berges (1)	Donald R. Lehmann (4)	Wayne S. Desarbo (5)
8	Terry Elrod (9)	Ward Hanson (1)	William Putsis, Jr. (9)	Scott Fay (5)
9	Miklos Sarvary (9)	John Gourville (1)	Xavier Drèze (8)	Carl F. Mela (10)
10	Wujin Chu (9)	William H. Greene (1)	Yunchuan Liu (4)	Douglas Bowman (11)
11	Xavier Drèze (8)	Arnaud De Bruyn (3)	Eyal Biyalogorsky (5)	Rick L. Andrews (7)
12	Eric Bradlow (8)	Birger Wernerfelt (2)	Abbie Griffin (5)	Eitan Gerstner (6)
13	Mary W. Sullivan (8)	M. L. "Bob" Emiliani (1)	Ernan Haruvy (3)	Eric Anderson (5)
14	Florian Zettelmeyer (8)	Liran Einva (1)	Wayne S. Desarbo (5)	Nanda Kumar (7)
15	Ramarao Desiraju (8)	Sanjeev Swami (1)	Vicki G. Morwitz (4)	Werner Reinartz (5)
16	Bart Bronnenberg (8)	Arvid Johnson (1)	Scott Fay (5)	Yong Liu (7)
17	Marnik Dekimpe (8)	Josephine Woltman Elpers (1)	Wilfred Amaldoss (4)	Ashutosh Prasad (5)
18	Rick L. Andrews (7)	Esther Gal-Or (2)	Jianan Wu (3)	Gila E. Fruchter (7)
19	Nanda Kumar (7)	Jean-Pierre Dubé (2)	Carl F. Mela (10)	Aradhna Krishna (6)
20	Yong Liu (7)	Allen Weiss (1)	Charles Moul (3)	Rami Zwick (5)
21	Gila E. Fruchter (7)	Jayson Lusk (1)	S. Chan Choi (3)	Sachin Gupta (6)
22	Elie Ofek (7)	John Hauser (6)	James A. Dearden (4)	Eric Bradlow (8)
23	Rajeev K. Tyagi (7)	Eugene Anderson (1)	Douglas Bowman (11)	Yuxin Chen (11)
24	Russell S. Winer (7)	Darren Filson (2)	Rick L. Andrews (7)	Elie Ofek (7)
25	Vithala C. Rao (7)	Jacob Goldenberg (2)	Eitan Gerstner (6)	Terry Elrod (9)
26	Praveen K. Kopalle (7)	Colin F. Camerer (1)	Dave Godes (3)	Mary W. Sullivan (8)
27	Shuba Srinivasan (7)	Eitan Muller (1)	Eric Anderson (5)	K. Sudhir (5)
28	Fred Feinberg (7)	Vikas Mittal (1)	Duncan I. Simester (4)	Tat Chan (5)
29	V. (Seenu) Srinivasan (7)	Christophe Van Den Bulte (9)	Nanda Kumar (7)	Dmitri Kuksov (5)
30	John Hauser (6)	Olivier Toubia (3)	Werner Reinartz (5)	Yun Jeong Choi (5)
31	Eitan Gerstner (6)	Avi Goldfarb (1)	Jorna Leenheer (3)	Hao Zhao (6)
32	Aradhna Krishna (6)	Donald R. Lehmann (4)	Yong Liu (7)	Peter T. L. Popkowski Leszczyc (5)
33	Sachin Gupta (6)	Fred Zufryden (2)	Kutsal Dogan (3)	Rajeev K. Tyagi (7)
34	Hao Zhao (6)	Frank R. Kardes (2)	Ashutosh Prasad (5)	Aviv Nevo (5)
35	Michael V. Lewis (6)	Givon Moshe (1)	Joel H. Steckel (4)	Jeff Inman (5)

12. (cont'd.)

Rank	Reviewers listed by number of reports completed	Reviewers listed by best turnaround times	Reviewers listed by best turnaround times (three or more reports)	Reviewers listed by best turnaround times (five or more reports)
36	Peter Fader (6)	Praveen Aggarwal (1)	Joffre Swait (4)	Russell S. Winer (7)
37	Barry L. Bayus (6)	Kenneth Train (2)	Gila E. Fruchter (7)	Verinda Kadiyali (5)
38	Anita Elberse (6)	Suman Mallik (1)	Aradhna Krishna (6)	Florian Zettelmeyer (8)
39	Sridhar Balasubramanian (6)	Yongmin Chen (1)	Rami Zwick (5)	Leonard M. Lodish (5)
40	Kusum Ailawadi (6)	William Putsis, Jr. (9)	Sachin Gupta (6)	Vithala C. Rao (7)
41		Ivan Png (2)	Eric Greenleaf (3)	Michael V. Lewis (6)
42		Rakesh Vohra (2)	Yuanping Ying (3)	Peter Fader (6)

Note. The number of reports is in parentheses.

13. A Few Very Recent Highly Cited *Marketing Science* Articles by Year

Year	Authors/Title	Volume/Issue
2001	Nijs, V. R., M. G. Dekimpe, J. B. E. M. Steenkamp, D. M. Hanssens: The category-demand effects of price promotions	20/1
	Xie, J. H., S. M. Shugan: Electronic tickets, smart cards, and online prepayments: When and how to advance sell	20/3
	Desai, P. S.: Quality segmentation in spatial markets: When does cannibalization affect product line design?	20/3
	Sudhir, K.: Competitive pricing behavior in the auto market: A structural analysis	20/1
2002	Yang, S., G. M. Allenby, G. Fennell: Modeling variation in brand preference: The roles of objective environment and motivating conditions	21/1
	Moe, W. W., P. S. Fader: Using advance purchase orders to forecast new product sales	21/3
	Ter Hofstede, F., M. Wedel, J. B. E. M. Steenkamp: Identifying spatial segments in international markets	21/2
2003	G. Iyer, A. Pazgal: Internet shopping agents: Virtual co-location and competition	22/1
	Danaher, P. J., I. W. Wilson, R. A. Davis: A comparison of online and offline consumer brand loyalty	22/4
	Toubia, O., D. I. Simester, J. R. Hauser, E. Dahan: Fast polyhedral adaptive conjoint estimation	22/3

Note. Ranked by year, then by citations reported by ISI web of knowledge combined citation index. Citations are very early and, hence, extraordinarily preliminary. Citations only include cites by ISI journals.