Editorial: The next leg for *Operations Management Research*

Jan Olhager • Scott Shafer

Published online: 4 July 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

The first issue of *Operations Management Research (OMR)* saw the light in 2008. It was a result of the efforts by Jack Meredith and Patrick McMullen. With a specific focus on bringing practice and theory together *OMR* has managed to position itself well among the operations management journals. *OMR* has gained a reputation for promoting research that is relevant to both practitioners and researchers. The subtitle of the journal describes this relationship well: “*Advancing practice through theory*”.

We have now accepted the responsibility to carry the *OMR* torch for the next leg and keep the journal in a competitive mode for the next five years. First, we would like to thank Jack and Patrick for a job well done for creating the journal and establishing *OMR* as an OM journal with a good reputation. They have done a remarkable job in putting *OMR* on the map so quickly. They have excelled at the fundamental OM traits that we teach our students: quick response (for authors), quality (of papers), flexibility (in topic area and research methodology), cost efficiency (for operating the journal), and delivery dependability (for new issues). Typically, the last trait may be difficult to live up to for a new journal – at least initially – but the journal has improved its performance in this area as well. Now, after four years, we can definitely state that the journal has established itself on the OM journal arena. Statistics on submissions and response rates for the journal’s first five

years are provided in the table at the end of this paper. It is worth pointing out that while the statistics on paper submissions might appear to reflect negatively on the progress the journal has made, in reality the drop off in submissions is actually due to a decline in inappropriate submissions as the scope of the journal has become better understood.

It is now our job to take *OMR* further. We will aim at “*editorial ambidexterity*” by exploiting the path and directions that Jack and Patrick started as well as exploring new avenues. We subscribe to the aims and scope of the journal, and to the initial editorial statement by Jack and Patrick: “Since operations management is an applied discipline it is the aim of *OMR* to promote research that advances both the theory and practice of operations management. Hence, each regular paper published in *OMR* must make a clear contribution to the science *and* practice of operations management and include discussion of the potential of the research for advancing OM theory as well as its application.”

Our vision for *OMR* is to develop the journal further as a journal that:

- Does not compromise on rigor or relevance.
- Is valued and respected by both practitioners and academics.
- Fosters dialogue on contemporary issues.

There are clear links between these issues. Rigor in research and relevance to practice are necessary. With both in place, the journal will be a valuable source of information and be respected by both practitioners and academics. In order to keep relevance, research needs to address contemporary issues. Therefore, we will be open for new areas, as long as there is relevance for OM and a contribution to both theory and practice.

We will place particular emphasis on the content of the abstracts. The abstract is a key source in explicating the novelty and contribution of the research. It should clearly

J. Olhager (✉)
Department of Industrial Management and Logistics,
Lund University,
Box 118, SE-22100 Lund, Sweden
e-mail: Jan.Olhager@tlog.lth.se

S. Shafer
Schools of Business, Wake Forest University,
3109 Warrell Professional Center, P.O. Box 7659, Winston-Salem,
NC 27109, USA
e-mail: shafersm@wfu.edu

state the topic, the motivation and relevance, the research methodology and its rigor, the key aspect or aspects of the article (reflecting originality), the key findings, and its contribution to theory and practice (i.e. implications for both researchers and managers). The abstract should be a clear and informative source for the reader to quickly understand the relevance and rigor of the article for both theory and practice.

We are particularly interested in exploring ways the journal can be used as a vehicle to foster a dialog of contemporary issues in operations management. For example, perhaps leading authorities can be invited to comment on published articles and these comments published right after the article with a rejoinder by the authors following these comments. Not only can such comments and rejoinders provide significant value to the reader, they can also transform the article into a dynamic dialogue. Furthermore, including comments from both practitioners and academics would increase the value added of the published articles and further differentiate *OMR* from other journals in the field. Taking this one step further, perhaps a website could be set up where all readers could comment on the published articles and comments. At

any rate, all input is welcome on ways the journal can be enhanced to create more value for the OM community.

We would like to point out that the *operations* in OM can be of many different kinds. It includes manufacturing operations, service operations, supply chain operations, as well as health care operations, humanitarian logistics, and other types of operations. We welcome newer perspectives such as sustainability and behavioral OM. *OMR* has no prejudice concerning the (preferred) choice of research methodology. Instead, *OMR* welcomes any research methodology: case, action, survey, mathematical modeling, simulation, etc. The use of multiple research methods is particularly welcomed.

Furthermore, we are open for suggestions for new special issues. Of course, they must meet the criteria mentioned above, i.e. rigor, relevance, contribution to theory and practice and deal with contemporary issues.

The most important aspect for the success of the journal is that we all continue to contribute to the journal and the OM community by doing research with rigor and relevance for both theory and practice and submitting it to *OMR*. So, keep submitting your good research to *OMR*.

Measure (cutoff is Dec. 31)	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Papers submitted	52	55	73	66	4
Papers accepted	15	10	14	12	1
Papers desk rejected	21	21	20	37	1
Papers rejected	16	22	20	6	1
Average time from initial submission to response to author for non-desk rejected papers	39 days	40 days	43 days	39 days	33 days
Time from initial submission to final acceptance	162 days	192 days	95 days	153 days	79 days