

Pre-submission checklist

Peer review

- 1 Has the paper been presented at a conference or workshop (and has the manuscript been revised taking into account suggestions or comments)?
 - Editing*
 - 2 Is the manuscript in accordance with the author guidelines (consider headings, tables, footnotes)?
 - 3 Is the terminology used to describe events, variables and tests consistent?
 - 4 Is the structure of the manuscript consistent with published articles in the journal of choice?
 - 5 Consider getting the manuscript professionally edited?
 - Journal choice*
 - 6 Is the manuscript being sent to the most appropriate journal? (Consider: Journal rankings; Does the manuscript extend literature in the journal? How many times you have cited the journal? Are citations to the professional literature rather than the academic literature?)
 - Title*
 - 7 Is the title appropriate? (i.e. Does it indicate what you are investigating?)
 - Objective, motivation, contribution*
 - 8 Does the introduction describe what was done, what was found, why it was done (i.e. why it is an interesting issue) and what it adds to the literature?
 - 9 Is the introduction less than four pages? (Four pages is not a strict limit but the manuscript should not overwhelm the reader with too much detail).
 - Story*
 - 10 Does the story create expectations?
 - 11 Does the preceding discussion lead to the hypothesis?
 - 12 Can hypotheses be formulated even if they are not stated in the paper?
 - 13 Are the hypotheses directional?
 - Data*
 - 14 Is there a convincing reason why the data and sample selection criteria are suitable?
 - 15 Are the data and sample selection criteria well described?
 - 16 Is the treatment of outliers described?
 - 17 Is the partitioning of data into sub-samples described and justified?
 - 18 Does the number of observations change from table to table? Why?
 - Analysis*
 - 19 Are all variables described?
 - 20 Is there a table of descriptive statistics (including means and medians)?
 - 21 Is there a correlation matrix?
 - 22 Does the statistical analysis test the stated hypotheses?
 - 23 If data are pooled consider year-by-year regressions as sensitivity analysis.
 - 24 Is the order of the description of variables in the text, the same as the model, the tables and the discussion of the results?
 - 25 Are the reported table headings and content consistent in style?
 - Results*
 - 26 Are the tables and figures self-contained?
 - 27 Does the manuscript include any policy implications? (This may be linked to the 'so what' question in the introduction).
 - 28 Do the reported results include conclusions beyond the sample included the study?
-

Peer review

Referencing

- 29 Are citations in the text consistent (especially with regard to '&' and 'and' and *et al.*)?
- 30 Are there missing references?
- 31 Are there references for which there is no citation in the text?
- 32 Are the authors' names spelt correctly? (They might be the reviewer).
- 33 Is the date (year) correct and consistent between citation and reference list?
- 34 Are references consistent with the journal guidelines?
- 35 Are the references in alphabetical order?
- 36 Have references been updated? (Since the project began, some working papers may be now published).
- 37 If the references are to a professional source (refer it to that source and not an academic paper).
- 38 If the reference is to an academic source refrain from quoting a textbook.

Re-submissions

- 39 Try to address all reviewers' comments. If the reviewer has misunderstood the manuscript – take the view that manuscript needs to better explain the issue.
- 40 Write a memo that outlines what alterations have been made. Do not simply state 'corrected' (unless it is for a minor typo).

Source: Bradbury, M. E., 2012, Why you don't get published: an editor's view, *Accounting and Finance* 52, 343–358.