



## Resources for Reviewers

The resources provided here are a curation of *MISQ* editorials for authors<sup>1</sup>.

*MISQ* offers author development workshops and reviewer development workshops which are announced on the *MISQ* web site, AISWorld, and *MISQ*'s social media forums.

---

[Writing a Virtuous Review](#) (Arun Rai, *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. iii-x/September 2016)

Defines the roles of senior editor, associate editor and reviewer in the *MISQ* review process, differentiates between a constructive and destructive mindset of reviewers, and discusses why participating in reviewing is important. Provides guidelines about how a reviewer can write a virtuous review—one that adds value to the to the editors, the reviewed work, the authors, and the reviewer. Also discusses how a revision can be effectively reviewed.

[How Reviews Shape \*MIS Quarterly\*: A Primer for Reviewers and Editors](#) (Rajiv Kohli and Detmar Straub, *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 35 No. 3 pp. iii-vii/September 2011)

Discusses how important high-quality reviews are to the *MIS Quarterly* and how the review process shapes the journal. Identifies practices to avoid Type 1 and Type II errors in the reviewing process.

[Diamond Mining or Coal Mining? Which Reviewing Industry Are We In?](#) (Detmar Straub, *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. iii-viii/June 2009).

Discusses the critical role of a positive attitude of reviewers toward the research they are reviewing to give every paper a fair hearing. Differentiates between a diamond mining and coal mining predisposition to reviewing. Offers suggestions on how reviewers and editors can adopt a proactive and constructive stance in the reviewing process.

---

<sup>1</sup> This curation of *MISQ* editorials was developed by Arun Rai (September 15, 2019).

**Type II Reviewing Errors and the Search for Exciting Papers** (Detmar Straub, *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 32 No. 2 pp. v-x/June 2008)

Discusses why papers with exciting ideas that change the way we look at phenomenon are rejected at top journals. Three factors are identified as contributing to such Type II errors: (i) dominance of methodological considerations in review recommendations, (ii) misplaced democracy degrading the reviewing process, and (iii) editorial influence and signaling to reviewers not effectively exercised by editors.

**Looking for Diamond Cutters** (Carol Saunders, *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 29 No. 1 pp. iii-viii/March 2005)

Discusses the role of a reviewer as a diamond cutter where the reviewer helps in polishing manuscripts so that the gem in the paper can surface and shine. Suggests that reviewers should try to counter every problem they identify with a suggestion to address the problem.

**A Personal Perspective on the State of Journal Refereeing** (Robert W. Zmud, *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 22 No. 3 pp. xlv-xlvi/September 1998)

Identifies a set of desirable referee behaviors including volunteering to review, timely submission of reviews, and providing constructive reviews.