

Organization Science Manuscript Length Policy

Although Organization Science provides strong guidance on manuscript length, we have determined that universal page limits would be inconsistent with the diversity of the research we invite here. Because we recognize that each manuscript we receive and potentially publish has unique characteristics that determine both a reasonable and ideal length, we provide strong guidance below while allowing handling editors flexibility to determine the appropriate length based on their specialized expertise.

We also recognize, however, that excessive manuscript length can burden editors and reviewers and weaken the paper's impact and efficacy. Excessive length is commonly a function of insufficient editing on both content and exposition. Furthermore, like with all journals, page capacity at Organization Science is limited, and unnecessarily long papers reduce our ability to publish other important contributions. The goal of both editors and authors should be to balance these tradeoffs in ways that best advance our field.

Initial Submissions

Initial submissions should strive to be less than 50 pages of double-spaced 12-point text with 1-inch margins, all-inclusive, or 40 pages in 11-point font. Fonts similar to Garamond or Times New Roman should be used (please, no Helvetica Narrow). We strongly prefer this format for all submissions, but authors are allowed to deviate if reformatting would be onerous or if approved by the editor-in-chief. Editors who identify an excessively long submission can desk reject it with the option to resubmit a shorter manuscript. Papers far shorter than 50 pages are welcomed.

All authors should consider how the following components can streamline a manuscript:

1. Efficiency in Exposition
 - Careful copyediting can identify redundant content, inefficient sentence structure, and unnecessary arguments and tangents. Copyediting is time-consuming for the author and goes far beyond simple proofreading, but it improves accessibility to the review team and other readers. The burden for efficient exposition is on the submitting authors.
2. References
 - The quantity and relevance of references should not detract from the ease of reading the paper. We discourage “citation dumps,” and authors are expected to represent the contents of referenced manuscripts accurately. We do not require references to be perfectly formatted for the journal for initial submission, as this can be corrected should the paper near publication.
3. Tables and Figures
 - Figures that can parsimoniously represent theoretical arguments, data, empirical settings, and results are greatly welcomed. For quantitative work, figures are also preferable to tables if they convey the key results of robustness tests, descriptive statistics, or secondary/tertiary information. For qualitative work, figures may complement textual descriptions. Tables can always be relegated to an appendix if reviewers want additional details. Figure titles and notes should allow a reader to understand key points and the figure generation process or source without repeatedly referencing the main text.

- Tables should be formatted as efficiently as possible. For quantitative work, authors are discouraged from presenting extensive control variable coefficients/estimates beyond primary models. For qualitative work, tables can provide effective ways to provide additional data, description of data and methods, summary information about the setting and participants, and further information into the analysis process. For all work, they can be effective for classifying and presenting key existing literature and other content that might be overwhelming to the reader in paragraph form. Like with figures, tables titles and notes should help tables stand on their own in communicating crucial information to the reader.
4. An Appendix is not meant for publication and would eventually be posted online as supplementary. Any appendix should be submitted as a standalone document “for review” with no information identifying the authors. Appendices should contain supporting material for the reviewer or editor that is unnecessary for evaluating the manuscript, except where it provides supporting evidence or clarifications that address reviewer or editor concerns. For example, an appendix could present alternative econometric models results rather than simply writing “alternative models are consistent with the primary specification” (which is not particularly credible nor specific). This material should be referenced in the main text. Examples include:
- “Models using an alternative Poisson model produce smaller but precise coefficients that are available in Appendix Table A3.”
 - “The interview protocol is provided in Appendix Section A.1”
 - “A table providing an analysis of deviant cases is presented as Appendix Table A.2.”
 - “Mediation model results for our data are presented as Appendix Figures A.3 and A.4, along with the methodological reasons why they are underpowered and produce biased estimates.”
 - “Screenshots of the Qualtrics-based experiment are provided in Appendix Section 4.”
 - “A formal analytical proof of Proposition 3 is provided in Appendix Section B.”
 - “Descriptions and results from three pilot studies used to refine the experimental design are available in Appendix C.”

Resubmissions

Invited revisions may exceed this page guidance with permission and guidance of the decision editor, with the understanding that fully accepted manuscripts will typically conform to a 50-page limit. Additional space may be granted by the editor-in-chief if both the handling editor and authors believe it is necessary to achieve the high potential impact of the research.

Author Responses to Editors/Reviewers

Authors are encouraged to carefully explain changes implemented during the revision of a manuscript in a way that does not overwhelm or obfuscate the key points of each response. Avoid redundant material between responses and papers. General policies and principles include:

- Do not directly quote your paper in the response document, except if the specific language used is crucial to present. Instead, paraphrase and reference where the specific text exists if necessary.
- Do not duplicate material in responses to each of the editors and reviewers. Detailed responses should be provided in one location that can be referenced in others.
- Use efficient writing to minimize response length.

- Include the editor/reviewer’s comment in italics—verbatim—to remind the party what they wrote many months ago.
- Tables and figures not intended for publication in the manuscript or appendix can be included if important to the response. For example, Monte Carlo simulations that demonstrate how a reviewer’s concerns of biased estimates are unjustified might be a footnote in a published paper but require detailed data presentation in a response document.
- Avoid combative or aggressive responses. If you disagree, you are welcome to make measured arguments explaining your position. Reviewers and editors are volunteers—don’t kill their prosocial or intrinsic motivation! Just because you believe they are wrong (or they are objectively wrong) does not mean they should be treated with ridicule or disrespect. All reviewers and editors are fallible—making mistakes does not imply a lack of diligence or motivation.
- Effusive praise for the editor or reviewers is not helpful to the review process and is not more likely to get your paper published. Our editorial team operates with the humility of knowing that we are neither oracles nor infallible. Instead of writing, “Your brilliant omnificence shines in this divine revelation of a comment,” simply write “this is a great suggestion that we’ve incorporated into the paper.” If you disagree with the comment, you are welcome to make measured and supported arguments explaining your position.

Any questions on manuscript length policy can be directed to EIC Lamar Pierce at oseic@wustl.edu.