Customer Needs and Solutions (CNS)

RESEARCH PAPERS

***CNS* Seeks Research Papers With The Following Characteristics:**

Papers with Major Upside Potential for Impact

- Papers with major upside potential for impact are those that could, for example, change paradigms, create substantial value for one or more stakeholders, and/or receive a very high number of citations. A paper with no upside potential will be desk rejected.
- Impact can take one or more forms including, but not limited to:
    - Helping other scholars do better research;
    - Helping practitioners (especially C-suite executives) create substantial value;
    - Informing policy makers (and NGOs); and
    - Enhancing consumer welfare.

High Risk, High Reward

- Seeking high return (high impact research) requires tolerating high risk. *CNS* is willing to do precisely this.
- High risk tolerance means we are willing to publish papers with the *potential* to make a substantial impact on our stakeholders, not just papers guaranteed to do so. The higher the potential upside of a paper, the higher our tolerance of this uncertainty.
- High risk tolerance means we are willing to publish controversial material, provocative results, etc., which might be proven wrong in the future, but pass the current evaluation on rigor. We may attach a "warning label" to such publications.
- High risk tolerance also means we are willing to publish papers without asking authors to "dot every *i* and cross every *t*."

Impact, Not Completeness

- We seek impact, not completeness. Papers otherwise considered speculative or too preliminary elsewhere are welcomed at *CNS*, as long as major upside potential is demonstrated.
- Examples include a new theory or framework with no data, intriguing findings with no theoretical explanation, a promising method with limited empirical validation and/or model comparisons, a paradigm-changing idea, etc. As long as there is potential for high impact, the work will be considered.

- In short, we welcome ambitious papers that may not be fully developed because we believe such papers will accelerate the diffusion of new ideas and tools and help promote further research.

Why Should You Publish Your Best Research Papers in *CNS*?

- A paper published in *CNS* will acquire the prestige analogous to papers at *Science* or *Nature* in the eyes of anyone who cares about customers and solutions. Your work will be associated with other papers characterized by high relevance and impact.
- You can publish your brilliant work that is considered too radical or insufficiently developed by existing journals; such papers are welcomed and sought by *CNS*.
- Your paper will be reviewed quickly. The review process is similar to *Science* or *Nature*, with a 6-week initial turnaround time and a 5-month total process from submission to acceptance.
- You will enjoy a very efficient review and publication process with no additional rewriting required before submission. Low revision effort will be required if we like the work and we will reuse existing reviews from other journals listed under Supporting Evidence.
- You can provide alternate evidence that supports the value of your work, fostering the democratic nature of the publication process. This reduces the chance of a paper being rejected due to the idiosyncratic preferences of one or two particular reviewers.
- You will get maximum impact from your work. In addition to publishing a traditional paper journal, *CNS* will disseminate the work in a way that harnesses the power of new media technology in the digital age (i.e., online Supplementary Materials, video, audio, PowerPoint, Twitter, etc.). *CNS* will actively promote the work to stakeholders (i.e., firms, policy makers, NGOs, media, academics) and will aim to stimulate follow-up research.

Submission

Cover Letter

Please include with your submission a cover letter containing:

- The title of the paper and a statement summarizing its main point.
- List of the supporting material submitted with the manuscript.
- Names of thesis advisors of all authors. *The journal does not allow an advisor review his/her current/former students' manuscripts.*
- Names of colleagues who have reviewed the paper.
- Additional information that will ensure a fair review process.
- Names, telephone numbers, and email addresses for all authors.

Manuscript Format at Submission

- We encourage authors to submit papers in the *CNS* format, modeled after the journal *Science*. (see CNS style described under **Publication/Dissemination Format** for accepted paper).
- To reduce initial effort, authors may submit papers in any format (and length) accepted by top marketing journals; however, one such format should be consistently followed throughout the paper.
- Papers must be well written.
- Authors agree to revise their papers to the format specified by *CNS* once they are accepted for publication.

Supporting Evidence

Authors are encouraged to submit supporting material to speed up the review process and to provide third-party evidence to support their work. These include, but are not limited to:

- Reviews from the following list of journals: *Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Management Science, and Marketing Science*. CNS will consider manuscripts that are rejected despite merit at these journals, but fit with CNS' mission. When submitting reviews, please:
  - Submit the complete set (not selected parts) of reviews from a journal.
  - Please provide a statement (1-2 pages) in response to those reviews (including what the review team has missed).
  - Disclose all journals in this list to which you have submitted the manuscript. If you send in reviews from one such journal, the Senior Editor has the right to ask to see reviews from all other journals in that list that have reviewed your paper, <u>if </u>he or she is positively disposed towards the paper.
  - A paper that has been rejected by a journal in this list that does not fit *CNS*'s mission will be desk rejected.
- Detailed supporting letters from academic experts
  - Authors must disclose any conflicts of interest. (e.g., co-authorship, past or current advisor/advisee, past or current colleagues at the same institution, etc.).
  - These supporting letters will be published online in the Supplemental Materials if a paper is accepted.
- Detailed supporting letters from practitioners
  - Authors must disclose any conflicts of interest (e.g., financial ties, non-financial working relationships, etc.)
  - These supporting letters will be published online in the Supplemental Materials if a paper is accepted.

- Evidence that other papers have already cited the paper, substantiating its (potential) impact.
- Other material attesting to the value of the paper. (Authors may check with the Editor-in-Chief before submission.)

Review

Criteria used in desk rejection

- No potential upside for impact.
- Not professionally written.

Process:

- The editorial team at *CNS* is comprised of the Editor-in-Chief (EIC), Senior Editors (SE), Associate Editors (AE), editorial board members, and ad hoc reviewers.
- The EIC will assign each new submission to a SE. The processing SE is normally an expert in the domain and is heavily involved in the review process.
- Based on the complete set of materials submitted, the SE can choose to:
  - Desk reject
  - Accept (conditionally)
  - Select an AE and reviewer(s) to read the paper before reaching a decision to:
    - Reject
    - Request a Revision (In this case, it is understood that the paper will be accepted if the authors successfully address the comments highlighted by the SE.)
    - Accept
- In general, the SE will not send the paper out for additional reviews (although he or she may consult an AE) if sufficient supplemental material has been submitted with the manuscript (e.g., a complete set of reviews from a journal in the list described under Supporting Evidence with a statement of response to those reviews from the author(s)).
- The SE may decide to seek an opinion from a practitioner if he or she deems it to be appropriate.
- If the SE decides to send the paper out for review:
  - He/she typically will use 2 reviewers, one of them may or may not be an AE.
  - The reviewer(s) are expected to complete reviews within 3 weeks.
  - In general, the SE will attempt to complete the entire review process within 6 weeks.
  - Exceptions to the review time policy:

- The SE will consider requests for an even faster turnaround time if an author is facing a critical deadline in his or her career (e.g., tenure review).
- Manuscripts submitted with supporting documents may receive the SE's decision within 2-3 weeks.
- Blind Review Policy
  - The journal adopts the double blind policy.
  - If a paper is desk rejected, the EIC will not reveal the identity of the SE to the authors.
- Avoiding conflict of interest in review:
  - The journal does not allow an individual review his/her current/former doctoral students' manuscripts (to whom he/she is/was the dissertation advisor).

Revision (Substance and Time)

- It is expected that if the authors address the key issues highlighted by the SE, the paper will be accepted.
- The SE generally will not request additional work that is expected to take more than 2 months.
- If the authors cannot return the completed revision within 6 months, *CNS* may treat the paper as a new submission.
- A paper will, in general, be either accepted or rejected after the second round.

Publication/Dissemination Format

We aim to broaden our reach among academics and practitioners. To this end, we will disseminate our content in ways that can be accessed, understood, appreciated, and used by people with no special training in the authors' specific domains of expertise.

- All accepted papers must conform to CNS manuscript style described below:
  - Each paper should have a length of 3-5 printed journal pages (~2500-4500 words) using language that can be understood by anyone with MBA training and/or with relevant practice experience. Exceptions may be made on a case-by-case basis. This is modeled after the style of *Science*, in which the longest articles are about 5 printed pages.
  - In general, this should include a brief introduction, followed by a statement of the specific scope of the study, followed by results (broadly defined) and then interpretations.
  - Please avoid statements of future work or claims of priority, and avoid repeating the conclusions at the end.
  - Caption for figures and tables should begin with an overall descriptive statement followed by additional text. It should be sufficiently informative

that a reader can understand the figure or table without referring to the main text.

- o All technical components will be published as online Electronic Supplementary Materials, including Materials and Methods, following the convention of *Science*. These should be written for someone trained in the authors' domain, and at a level of detail so that researchers can replicate the methods if they so choose. Authors are expected to report the exact stimuli used in experiments in their papers, which also will be published online. Authors can also submit audio, video file, datasets, etc.

- Authors are expected to produce a well-constructed PowerPoint presentation (slide deck) of an accepted paper (presentation materials used for an academic seminar are fine), with enough details in the notes component of each slide. The authors will provide free use of the presentation to anyone, and users must acknowledge the authors. If a user adapts the presentation (or one or a few slides), the users are expected to share the revised PowerPoint file under the same copyright agreement. *CNS* may modify (or remake) slide decks to facilitate their adoption.

- Authors are encouraged to submit a short video segment (maximum 5 minutes) related to their paper (e.g., monologue, interview, etc.). Alternatively, the processing SE can interview the authors on the key points and relevance of their work, which can be video recorded and shared. Voice overs can be incorporated into publicly-available footage to highlight the key insights of the paper. The short video will be uploaded to YouTube and on the journal's website. If the authors choose not to create their own video, a member of the review team (the SE, AE, or reviewer) or a professional presenter will produce one for them. This short video is designed to broaden the reach of the journal content to practitioners and people who acquire knowledge in new media formats.

Springer