

Replication Corner

Replications are one of the building blocks of the structures of knowledge and are important for knowledge accumulation and for greater understanding of new and/or important effects.

The Replications Corner formerly published in IJRM will be moving to JMB effective with volume 2 (2016). This section invites researchers to submit Replication Notes with corresponding data. The replication should be performed for an important, interesting, or recently discovered phenomenon; this will be the major criterion of the review process and the decision to accept the replication note. Replication Notes should be short (not more than a few manuscript pages). Figures and tables will be posted online together with the data for future use by researchers interested in running meta-analyses or to compare findings.

We encourage replications of behavioral and quantitative phenomena. We target conceptual replications—authors are asked to replicate with a predefined deviation (e.g., added or relaxed constraints, modified product category or range of parameters, etc. for quantitative replications; different populations, products, manipulations, or other moderators for behavioral replications). This allows the reader to understand the relevance of the effect, its boundaries and underlying mechanisms. Reports about failure to replicate results and negative results are equally of interest for this corner.

In addition to contributing to our understanding of the validity, size, and boundaries of reported effects, the Replication Corner offers several additional benefits:

1. The accumulated data can be used for meta-analyses or other forms of data inference.
2. If researchers are aware that their own research findings may be replicated by other researchers, the section may contribute to higher standards for reporting results and handling data in the field and improve research output.

JMB Replication Corner Submission guidelines

1. Replications should be made on research papers that are substantive in nature with high relevance to, and well cited in, the extant marketing literature. Authors of Replication Notes should provide both the overall ISI citation counts to-date (Google Scholar citations may also be added but is optional) and its ranking among the papers published in the same year. These can be found on the Thomson Reuters Web of Science (formerly ISI Web of Knowledge). Replication Notes should be accompanied by a cover letter explaining why the authors think their replication is important and provide the aforementioned citation data.
2. Replication Notes should be short and written in a concise and clear writing style. They are limited to a 75 word abstract, 2000 words as text (include the word count in your submission), and up to 8 references can be included. The replication should include a short introduction on the chosen effect and the difference between the original paper and the replication. This should be followed by a detailed report of the procedure, summary of the results, and limitations of the replications.
3. Replication Notes should include a clear comparison of the results and indicate any difference in the participant population, data collection and/or the methods that were used between the original paper and the replication. Authors are encouraged to provide this comparison in a table.

4. Figures, tables, the data, and the code used should be submitted and will be posted on the website of the journal for public use.
5. The replication corner has four editors: Eric Bradlow, Joel C. Huber, Don Lehmann, and John Lynch, one of whom will process the submission.
6. Reports of failed replications are welcome, but we may invite the original authors to review the replication attempt. In such cases, a careful examination of quality checks becomes an important part of the report.
7. Authors should submit the paper where the original phenomenon is reported along with the Replication Note.
8. An important consideration in reviewing the replication is the appropriateness of the participant population used in experimental or empirical studies for the replication.
9. Potential authors may consult with the Reproduction Corner Editors by submitting a one-paragraph proposal for a pre-study evaluation.

Review process

1. The review process is shorter than for a regular submission. Decisions are based primarily on relevance and importance with the goal of one review round.
2. Each replication will be read by one of the Replication Corner Editors who will decide if it should be sent out for review. As mentioned earlier, the Replication Corner Editor might ask one of the authors of the original paper to review the replication. In these cases, a final decision (accept or reject) will be made after this round.
3. In some cases, based on the Replication Corner Editors' judgment, a short rejoinder might be invited.

Klaus Wertenbroch
JMB Editor-in-Chief