I wish to thank Linda Bamber for offering some constructive wording suggestions on a prior draft, though I take full responsibility for the final report.
I. INTRODUCTION

The Publications Committee and Executive Committee of the American Accounting Association (AAA) have adopted a new format and content for the annual reports submitted by AAA journal editors. My understanding of the spirit of the changes is to provide AAA constituents with more accountability of journal activities and decisions. I applaud this intent, and am pleased to submit this first Annual Report for The Accounting Review under the new guidelines. Given that this is the first year of the new format, I am also taking the liberty of interjecting some editorial commentary to assist the reader in interpreting the new data. That said, some of my interpretations reflect opinions, and the reader is certainly free to consider alternative interpretations.

The new report is broadly classified into two major sections. Section II below provides qualitative commentary on the editorial process followed by The Accounting Review under the current regime. Section III then follows with the tabular data requested by the AAA Publications Committee, along with some supplemental data I have provided to clarify certain aspects of these tables.

II. THE ACCOUNTING REVIEW EDITORIAL PROCESS

Transition

My term as Senior Editor of The Accounting Review (henceforth TAR) began on June 1, 2008, so this report covers the first fiscal year of operations under the new editorial regime, through May 31, 2009. Former Senior Editor Dan Dhaliwal and I agreed on some simple guidelines to ease the transition. Specifically, the former regime maintained full decision rights
over all manuscripts for which all material necessary for a decision was available to the former regime on May 31, 2008, even if the former regime had not yet processed its decision letter by that date. Thus, the current regime handled (1) in-process submissions awaiting one or more reviews as of June 1, 2008, and (2) all manuscripts (new or revised) submitted on or after June 1, 2008. For revised manuscripts in both categories, I considered factors on a case-by-case basis to determine whether to remand the decision back to the former regime or to transition it to the new regime, though most were transitioned. As the reader will see from the several TAR articles published in 2009 with a note indicating a decision under the new regime but thanking a former editor for serving as editor on one or more previous versions, there are simply too many revision files to justify remanding many of these to the former regime. At some point the term should end, giving former editors some relief from the time-intensive work they have just completed.

Process for New Submissions

Suitability for Review

When my Editorial Assistant Mary Capps receives a new TAR submission, her first step in the process, after assigning a sequential manuscript number and logging the submission in our system, is to search our computer database for related previous submissions by the same author(s). I have been surprised by the number of times that this process has uncovered a former closely related TAR submission, often with no disclosure in the correspondence accompanying the current submission. Mary prints and provides me with copies of both manuscripts in such circumstances. If I conclude that the submission is effectively a revision of a manuscript previously rejected by TAR with no invitation to revise and resubmit, I generally log the decision as a desk rejection and send an explanatory letter to the author(s). My co-editors and I adopted this policy to treat all authors fairly and consistently, given that TAR’s large submissions volume
forces us to allocate scarce reviewer and time resources carefully by offering a revision opportunity only to the most promising manuscripts. Put simply, the distinction between a “reject” and a “revise and resubmit” outcome has to mean something, or we lose control over the process and could easily get overwhelmed by “appeals.”

To be sure, sometimes a new submission that overlaps somewhat with a previously rejected manuscript by the same author(s) is effectively a new study, especially if it asks a different research question and/or utilizes different data. These cases can boil down to judgment calls, so I will offer some well-intended advice to prospective authors. When submitting a manuscript that bears some relation to a manuscript by the same author(s) that was previously rejected by TAR, if the current submission is effectively a new study, explain why it is a new study in the cover correspondence to the editor. The editor will still desk reject the manuscript if the editor feels that the submission is more a revision of the rejected former submission than a new study, but the odds of convincing the editor go up substantially with full disclosure.

Assuming that a new submission clears the “new study” screen, I take a quick look at the manuscript to ensure that it is suitable for review, or, in exceptional circumstances, ask one of my co-editors to make that assessment. It is rare that we desk reject a manuscript for reasons other than the “double submission” problem explained above, but this can happen if the submitted manuscript (1) does not appear relevant to accounting, even broadly defined, (2) is so difficult to follow that the editor cannot grasp the research question or primary conclusions, or (3) does not appear to use the tools of the scientific method (broadly construed to include all forms of empirical, archival, experimental, field, survey, and modeling analyses) to investigate a relation between constructs. The third category includes commentaries that espouse an opinion without evidential or analytic support, not because such efforts are unimportant, but because
TAR’s primary mission as stated in its Editorial Policy is for “publishing articles reporting the results of accounting research.” Other publication venues are more well-suited to unsolicited commentaries. These points notwithstanding, it is important to put the desk-reject option in perspective. For the journal year ending May 31, 2009, desk rejections for the reasons explained in this paragraph accounted for only about 2% of all new submissions, and the majority of those were due to lack of perceived relevance to accounting, even broadly defined. Thus, the vast majority of TAR submissions enter the review process.

**Identifying Reviewers**

Assuming that a new submission is suitable for review, the next step in the process is to identify prospective reviewers. We have several searchable resources for this purpose, including (1) a database of TAR article titles and keywords dating back to 1997, (2) a combined (huge) pdf file of the academic vitae of all members of the TAR Editorial Advisory and Review Board, (3) a list of expertise keywords submitted by the Editorial Advisory and Review Board members upon invitation to the Board, (4) citation analyses, and (5) the manuscript itself, including its cited references. I usually ask my doctoral research assistant Tracie Majors to conduct searches of this nature, using the submitted manuscript’s keywords and introductory pages to gain a sense of the research question, primary findings, and any potential conflicts of interest with competing papers or competing views. To be clear, Tracie only offers suggestions (typically a long list). I make the decisions, after clearing prospective reviewer names against another database of current review assignments. Generally, once a reviewer receives a review request from TAR, that person is off limits for further requests for two months, with the exception of requests involving invited revisions, as we have no choice for revisions if we wish to retain reviewer continuity.
TAR avoids assigning reviewers who have known conflicts of interest from affiliations with the author(s) by institution, doctoral supervision, or recent coauthorship. TAR also uses a double-blind review process. That said, prospective reviewers sometimes inform us of prior knowledge of a manuscript from having seen it presented or (sometimes) by having reviewed it previously for a different journal. Our policy is that such instances do not automatically disqualify a reviewer, so long as that reviewer is comfortable undertaking an independent review of the manuscript as currently submitted. However, if the reviewer is uncomfortable, we are certainly willing to recuse that reviewer from the assignment. Finally, although I try to avoid assigning a reviewer who is known to be associated with the author, I do not consider the author(s)’ acknowledgements note in making this determination. In fact, I try to ignore that note altogether. My rationale is to remove any strategic implications of acknowledgments. That is, if acknowledgments were to influence the review process, some authors might be tempted to “game” the process by acknowledging a dreaded reviewer or not acknowledging a desired reviewer. As Senior Editor, I certainly would not want to discourage authors (especially newer authors) from seeking feedback from a respected scholar in the area for fear of disqualifying that individual as a reviewer.

Following tradition, TAR’s general policy is to designate two independent reviewers for each new submission that is suitable for review. Given this policy, a senior editor learns quickly that reliable reviewers are a very scarce resource relative to the volume of submissions. The 124 members of the TAR Editorial Advisory and Review Board are our most demanded reviewers, reflecting their expertise as well as their track record of constructive and timely reviews. A total of 124 Editorial Board members may seem a large number, but it is not, at least not relative to the volume of new submissions.
Each Board member agrees to complete six reviews of new submissions each year in addition to reviewing occasional revisions. Even with a workload that intense, we would very quickly run out of available Board members at any point in time if we sent each submission to two members of the Board. Accordingly, *ad hoc* reviewers (often researchers who have published at least one article in *TAR* since 1997) are vital to the process, and are named (with my deepest gratitude) at the end of this report. A common approach for many new submissions is to designate one reviewer from the Editorial Advisory and Review Board or a close substitute (e.g., a senior *ad hoc* reviewer with a proven track record in the area of the submission) and one more junior reviewer. To answer a question I fielded at the 2008 AAA New Faculty Consortium, assistant professors should never assume that a review request to a less experienced reviewer signals the editor’s perception that the manuscript is of relatively low quality. A signal of that nature would be very unfair to submitting authors, so let me be clear that reviewers at all levels of experience receive review requests from *TAR* for only one reason: expertise in the area of the submitted manuscript. Another “non-signal” in the process is the designation of Reviewer A and Reviewer B. I employ an algorithm based on the manuscript number to ensure that the A/B designation is completely arbitrary.

**Assigning an Editor**

After identifying two qualified and available reviewers for a new submission (a process I feel is important to centralize to ensure a reasonable degree of uniformity over reviewer selection), the next step is to assign an editor. As the reader will see from *TAR*’s inside cover material, I am privileged to serve with 13 outstanding co-editors, each with full decision rights for all manuscripts assigned to that editor.
I try to match manuscripts with the most well-suited editor from both a topical and methodological perspective, but this matching process is subject to an important caveat. Namely, part of the “contract” I arranged with each of my co-editors at the onset of my term was to limit their editorial assignments to three new submissions per month. This arrangement makes me the “residual claimant” once the three-per-month constraint becomes binding for any given co-editor. The constraint is especially binding for my co-editors whose expertise is primarily in financial empirical-archival research, which alone accounts for nearly half of our submissions, as detailed later in this report. To get specific, Professors Kallapur, Thomas, Trombley, Walther, and Zarowin can always count on three “editor requests” each month. For other co-editors, the “three-per-month” constraint is binding in many but not all months, depending on our submissions flow. For the journal year ending May 31, 2009, TAR processed 719 editorial decision letters (including letters on revisions, as detailed later in this report), of which 345 (48.0%) were written by yours truly, 333 (46.3%) were written by one of my 13 co-editors, 34 (4.7%) were remanded back to one of the editors from the former regime, and 7 (0.9%) were written by a special ad hoc editor.

When accepting an editor assignment, the editor (if other than me) also considers the reviewers I propose from the reviewer identification process. The editor either approves the suggested reviewers as proposed or suggests alternate reviewer(s). If the editor’s alternate reviewer(s) are available, the assigned editor’s preference takes priority. We do not send out review requests until the assigned editor approves those requests.

Reviews and Decisions

In addition to requesting a review report that we can send to the author(s), our regime has implemented a two-page “Review Form,” as reproduced in Appendix A to this report. We prefer
that reviewers complete the Review Form in lieu of a cover letter to the editor. The first page of
the form places the reviewer’s recommendation into one of five categories: (1) conditional
accept, (2) revise and resubmit, (3) uncertain, (4) reject due to insufficient contribution, or
(5) reject due to validity threat. The two reject categories reflect an attempt to give the editor
some guidance as to whether the primary objection leading to a reject recommendation is that the
manuscript’s claims are insufficient for publication in TAR (contribution) or because the
reviewer feels that the claims lack validity. The “uncertain” category is for (ideally rare) cases in
which it is genuinely unclear whether even a diligent revision could potentially address the
concerns raised, but the reviewer is willing to consider such an effort if the author(s) see a viable
revision path that is not apparent to the reviewer.

Editorial decision letters follow the same five categories. For new submissions, the vast
majority of decisions are logged as a rejection due to insufficient contribution (45.5%), a
rejection due to validity threat (24.8%), or an invitation to revise and resubmit (18.8%).
“Uncertain” decision letters are less frequent (10.5%), and convey explicitly that the editor is
guardedly willing to allow a revision, but cannot realistically encourage a revision unless the
author(s) see a way to address significant concerns that imply considerable outcome risk.
“Uncertain” letters ask author(s) to submit an email reply indicating whether or not the author(s)
intend to exercise the revision option the editor is allowing but does not necessarily encourage.
Author(s) should understand that the probability of an eventual acceptance is relatively low when
the first-round letter follows the “uncertain” template.

I read each decision letter written by one of my co-editors and sometimes suggest edits,
though I try not to micromanage the process. I never overrule a co-editor’s decision; assigning a
manuscript to a co-editor gives that co-editor full decision rights.
Revisions

Our standard procedure, subject to override in exceptional cases, is to send first revisions back to the same reviewers. The reviewers’ second-round evaluations form the primary input for the editor’s decision, so a “revision” option by no means guarantees eventual publication, though the odds do improve relative to first-round decisions. If further revision is invited, the editor assesses on a case-by-case basis whether it is necessary to return a second revision to one or both reviewers or if the editor can reach an informed decision on a second revision without further independent review. Third revisions (i.e., fourth round) and beyond are rare. Of the 719 decisions reached during the journal year ending May 31, 2009, only 13 (1.8%) were in the fourth round, and none went to a fifth round.

Consistent with TAR’s stated Editorial Policy, we expect author(s) to submit a revision within one year after receiving an invitation to revise. Although I have been willing to “grandfather in” revisions of older files from first submissions predating the current regime, the first-round “revise-and-resubmit” letters written after June 1, 2008 have stated the one-year expectation explicitly, and I anticipate enforcing it when necessary.

III. EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATION STATISTICS

This section of the report provides specific tables requested by the AAA Publications Committee, along with some supplemental data for clarification. To differentiate the supplemental material, each table first reports the specific data requested by the Publications Committee, followed by any supplemental data explained in the discussion of each table.

Table 1: Annual Activity Summary

Table 1, Panel A reconciles TAR’s workflow for the journal year ending May 31, 2009, accounting for the 719 decisions referenced in Section II of this report. As noted in Panel A,
TAR received 557 new submissions during the year (excluding four invited commentaries),\(^1\) which sets an all time record by far. My co-editors and I are processing decision letters every day of the week, including weekends. Of course, some days are more saturated than others.

A limitation of Table 1, Panel A, is that logging all submissions results in double counting some manuscript files, to the extent that TAR often receives two or more versions of the same manuscript within the same year, following invitations to revise and resubmit. Accordingly, the reader should be aware that the 719 decisions reflect 646 unique manuscript files, with the difference of 73 representing revisions of manuscripts for which previous decisions inviting revision had already been logged within the same fiscal year.

Table 1, Panel A is in a different format and covers a different period (the journal’s fiscal year instead of the calendar year) than in the “Editorial Data” reports of prior TAR volumes. To facilitate comparability, Table 1, Panel B provides the same new submission data as in prior Editorial Data reports, using calendar years instead of the fiscal year, through calendar 2008.\(^2\) The excess of the fiscal year new submissions through May 31, 2009 (557) over the new submissions for calendar year 2008 (482) reflects TAR’s ever-increasing submissions rate. Indeed, the 482 new submissions received in calendar 2008 reflect a 146% increase from the 196 submissions ten years earlier (1998) and a 47% increase from the 327 submissions five years earlier (2003). This trend seems to be continuing.

**Table 2: Annual Outcome Summary**

Authors are always interested in acceptance rates, so Table 2 provides the outcomes for the 719 decisions reached during the fiscal year. As requested by the Publications Committee,

\(^1\) TAR published two research forums during 2009, each with an invited commentary to synthesize the research articles in that forum. In addition, TAR published two AAA Presidential Scholar Addresses during 2009, both invited.

\(^2\) Data for calendar 2009 are not yet available as of the date of this report.
this panel also reports two “acceptance rates.” The first rate of 16.6% divides the number of acceptances or conditional acceptances (81) by the number of final accept or reject decisions (489). The second rate of 11.3% divides the same 81 (conditional) acceptances by the total number of decisions reached (719). The difference in the two denominators reflects 230 invitations to revise and resubmit (of which 166 were in the “revise” category and 64 in the “uncertain” category). Undoubtedly the first rate somewhat overstates and the second rate somewhat understates the “true” acceptance rate. As an aside, Table 2 includes “conditional” acceptances in the acceptance category, as the conditions are generally minor and straightforward to address, so long as the author(s) are willing to do so. To date, we have yet to reject any manuscript that has reached “conditional acceptance” status.

Table 2 is subject to the same limitation noted earlier in the discussion of Table 1, Panel A: both tables double count manuscript files that receive two or more decisions within the same year due to an invitation to revise and resubmit. To get the breakdown of decisions for unique manuscript files (i.e., counting each manuscript only once), the number of revisions should be reduced by 73, the difference between the total number of decision letters (719) and the total unique manuscript files represented by those decisions (646). In turn, this observation suggests yet another possible “acceptance rate”: 81 (conditional) acceptances ÷ 646 unique manuscript files on which decisions were reached = 12.5%, bearing in mind that several of the 646 files are still open to revision.

The alert reader will observe that the 81 acceptances reported in Table 2 exceed the 65 refereed research articles actually published in *TAR* during calendar 2009 (which roughly corresponds to decisions reached during the fiscal year ending May 31, 2009, as the AAA requires the contents of each issue to be submitted to the AAA five months in advance of the
publication date). At the time of the editorial transition on June 1, 2008, TAR was operating on an issue-by-issue basis, meaning that the entire inventory of accepted manuscripts at any point in time comprised the articles submitted for the next issue’s due date. Since June 1, 2008, TAR has accumulated a bit of a “buffer” of accepted or conditionally accepted manuscripts (much to my relief). So, for example, as of June 1, 2009, the next acceptance would be scheduled for publication in March 2010. If and when TAR’s inventory buffer forces authors to wait more than a year to see their articles in print, the AAA and TAR editors may need to revisit policy questions regarding journal capacity, number of issues per year, and/or target acceptance rates.

Chart 1: Histogram of Editorial Rounds and Outcomes

The Publications Committee has asked for a histogram of decision outcomes by round, as reported in Chart 1. I am taking the liberty of reporting somewhat finer detail than that requested by the Committee, showing separate bars for “revise” and “uncertain” invitations as well as separate bars for “contribution” and “validity” rejections. The 552 first-round decisions in Panel A of Chart 1 differ from the 557 new submissions reported in Panel A of Table 1 because Chart 1 includes 93 new submissions “in process” as of June 1, 2008 and excludes 98 new submissions for which a decision had not yet been reached as of May 31, 2009.

Chart 1, Panel A shows that the best an author can realistically hope for in the first round is an invitation to revise and resubmit, though a first-round conditional acceptance is possible (we reached two of them this year). Clearly the most frequent first-round outcome is a rejection. As stated in TAR’s standard rejection-letter wording, a first-round rejection is intended in the best interest of all parties, avoiding the even-worse outcome of a multiple-round rejection.

Panels B and C of Chart 1 show that the likelihood of a favorable outcome increases dramatically in the second round and beyond, though there are no guarantees. We certainly try to
avoid the “disaster scenario” of a fourth-round rejection, though this did happen twice in 2009. To reiterate a point from Section II, the primary reason why the likelihood of acceptance goes up so dramatically for revisions is that my co-editors and I invite revision of only those manuscripts perceived to have the most potential (with the exception of manuscripts logged in the “uncertain” category). We simply cannot entertain revisions of rejected manuscripts unless the new paper clearly reports the results of a new study. I view this policy as being in author(s)’ best interests, to the extent that it is worthwhile to minimize the frequency of multiple-round rejections.

Table 3: Submissions and Acceptances by Area and Research Method

Several authors (e.g., Bonner et al. 2006; Heck and Jensen 2007; Hopwood 2007; Tuttle and Dillard 2007) have lamented the perceived narrowness of contemporary accounting scholarship, mostly with respect to the perception that the discipline is “consolidating around the area of financial accounting” (Tuttle and Dillard 2007, 395), particularly of the empirical-archival “capital markets” variety. Writings of this nature generally imply (if not explicitly state) that accounting journals and editorial biases are part of the problem. However, journals can only publish what they receive, such that a more comprehensive analysis compels consideration of both articles published and the underlying submission base rates. Former AAA President Shyam Sunder told me once that journals are intellectual mirrors of the scholarly communities they reflect. Table 3 attempts to put Professor Sunder’s mirror metaphor to the test, at least for The Accounting Review, reporting submission and acceptance rates by area and by method to see whether TAR’s mirror reflects accurately or is warped by editorial biases.

Table 3 reports fiscal 2009 submission and acceptance statistics by topic in Panel A and by method in Panel B, using the topical and methodological categories requested by the AAA Publications Committee. For each submission received during the year (but without double
counting revisions of manuscripts already logged), I determined and my assistant Mary Capps recorded the manuscript’s primary topic and method. To be sure, some manuscripts overlapped categories and required judgment, but I did my best to log the topic and method most closely reflecting the manuscript’s primary research objective. Table 3 reports only those submissions for which decisions were reached during the fiscal year ending May 31, 2009 (i.e., 646 unique manuscript files).

By far, the most frequent topical area is financial accounting and the most frequent method is empirical-archival (i.e., mostly “capital markets,” though I should hasten to acknowledge that financial-archival studies do not necessarily involve market data). The important observation, however, is that the high frequency of financial-archival research characterizes both submissions (52.2% financial and 73.7% archival) and acceptances (46.9% financial and 65.4% archival). In fact, the TAR acceptance bias, if any, seems to be slightly against financial-archival research. That said, my perspective as a researcher compels me to disclose that a contingency table analysis fails to reject the null hypothesis of equivalent submission and acceptance percentage frequencies by topical category ($\chi^2_{df=7} = 3.35; p > 0.50$) or by method ($\chi^2_{df=5} = 7.81; p = 0.17$).³ I was surprised at just how closely the acceptance percentages track the submissions percentages, even without any “quotas” to manage acceptances by category. And lest the reader infer that the data reported in Table 3 reflect changes in editorial policy, I conducted a less formal analysis of TAR acceptances and

---

³ Concerned that small cell sizes in the less frequent categories might be distorting the statistics, I repeated both the topical and methodological contingency table analyses after combining the “governmental/NFP,” “international,” “systems,” and “other” topics into a combined “other” topical category and after combining the “field/case,” “survey,” and “other” methods into a combined “other” methodological category. Results continue to fail to reject the null hypothesis of equivalent submission and acceptance percentages for both topical categories ($\chi^2_{df=4} = 1.68; p > 0.50$), and methodological categories ($\chi^2_{df=3} = 4.52; p = 0.21$).
submissions from 2004 to 2007 before I became senior editor (with thanks to the former editorial regime for giving me the data), reaching similar conclusions.

To offer a more specific categorization than that requested by the Publications Committee, Panel C of Table 3 matches the topical categories with the methodological categories. With no offense intended to those who conduct research on governmental/NFP, international, or systems topics or those who use field/case or survey methods, Panel C consolidates combinations involving these categories into “other” due to the very low (and sometimes zero) cell sizes that otherwise result from combining topics with methods. The reader can form his/her own interpretations of the data in Table 3, Panel C. My interpretation is that the high frequency of financial/archival articles in *TAR* has a simple explanation: *TAR* receives lots of financial/archival submissions.

These data should not be taken to imply that all is well with the discipline. Perhaps it is indeed the case that accounting as a discipline is consolidating too much around financial accounting, to repeat the excerpt from Tuttle and Dillard (2007). Dissertation statistics, for example, are revealing: Tuttle and Dillard (2007, 400) report that the percentage of accounting dissertations on financial topics increased from 38% in 1995 to 70% in 2005. My point is not to take a position on whether this trend is healthy or unhealthy. Rather, the more modest message of Table 3 is that, if financial accounting is dominating, something other than editorial bias at *The Accounting Review* is the reason. Revisiting Sunder’s mirror metaphor, *TAR*’s mirror seems reasonably accurate. It is up to the community to determine what gets reflected.

**Table 4: Author Affiliations**

Swanson et al. (2007) report research expressing the concern that journal articles in accounting are more concentrated among a narrower set of universities than research in other
disciplines. The Publication Committee’s request for the data reported in Table 4 reflects an attempt to gauge TAR’s diversity, both across schools and internationally. Panel A of Table 4 tallies the number of articles corresponding to each university for which at least one (co)author published an article among the 65 refereed articles in Volume 84 of TAR (i.e., calendar 2009). Articles written by k coauthors are attributed 1/k to each author’s affiliation, and if an author lists two affiliations, half of that author’s 1/k share is allocated to each affiliation. Because it seems marginally more interesting than alphabetical order, I list the institutions in Table 4, Panel A in descending order of the number of articles published. However, I strongly urge the reader to resist the temptation to view Panel A as yet another university ranking exercise. First, it reflects only one year of data. But more fundamentally, the broader point of Panel A is not that the University of Pennsylvania leads the pack with 2.42 articles (which is only 3.7% of the total, by the way). Rather, the primary message of Table 4, Panel A is that 85 universities and other institutions appeared at least once in a 2009 issue of TAR. I submit that this is a relatively diverse representation.

Table 4, Panel B reports data on international diversity. Specifically, Panel B tallies the 646 submissions for which TAR reached a decision during the fiscal year on unique manuscript files (i.e., without double counting any manuscripts with multiple submissions during the year due to one or more revisions) and the 81 acceptances or conditional acceptances reached in fiscal 2009, dividing each category into U.S. and non-U.S. authors (allocating 1/k credit to each of k coauthors). Panel B indicates that non-U.S. authors accounted for 25.2% of submissions and 19.6% of acceptances. The lower frequency of non-U.S. acceptances relative to submissions is marginally significant using Fisher’s Exact Test (p = 0.063). I hesitate to offer interpretations (if indeed the difference of 5.6% is meaningful), as I have no rigorous evidence to back any such
interpretations. My strong sense, however, is that any lower frequency of non-U.S. acceptances likely reflects correlated factors rather than overt bias against non-U.S. authors. And to look at the situation from the “glass half full” perspective, I believe it is noteworthy that approximately one out of five successful TAR authors is from a non-U.S. institution.

Table 5: Processing Time

Table 5, Panel A provides processing time data for the 719 decisions reached from June 1, 2008 through May 31, 2009, defining “processing time” as the number of days from the submission to the date my assistant Mary Capps sends the decision letter. The reader will see that roughly two-thirds of the decisions were reached within three months of submission, though, of course, this means that one-third were in process more than three months. Certainly my goal is for TAR to send a decision letter within three months of submission, and I was somewhat disappointed in our mean processing time of 81 days, wishing that it was closer to 60 or 70.

As partial explanation, some manuscripts caught in the editorial transition at June 1, 2008 tended to experience longer turnaround times. Table 5, Panel B (supplemental) reports similar data as Panel A, after deleting the 133 manuscripts submitted before June 1, 2008 that were in process on the date of the editorial transition. Panel B reports a lower mean for post-6/1/08 submissions (73 days), with 74.1% of decisions reached within three months of submission and 95.4% of decisions reached within four months of submission.

Serving as senior editor tends to confer a somewhat different perspective with respect to processing times. Clearly the easiest way to improve our turnaround times would be to desk reject more manuscripts, but that would hardly seem a beneficial change from the Association’s perspective. This observation reveals the overwhelming reason for late decisions: late reviewers.
My assistant Mary Capps sends the usual reminders, but sometimes these are of little avail. A journal governed by the community is at the mercy of the community.

At the onset of my editorship, I vowed to reach a decision with one review if both reviews were not in hand at the two-month point. This intent, however, proved easier to utter than to implement. Late reviewers will usually promise the late review within just a couple more weeks, and then a week after that, and so forth. Moreover, if the one review in hand recommends rejection, would the author rather we reach a decision with one review or wait two more weeks in hopes of getting a second opinion? Let us face facts. Experienced reviewers (and editors) are busy people. We do the best we can, but universities confer multiple demands that stretch our resources thin from time to time. These observations should not be taken as an attempt to rationalize late reviews or late decisions. If we like to receive a decision within three months after submission as authors, we should keep that expectation in mind when serving as reviewers (noting further that the editor will need some time to form a decision). The broader point, however, is that a few four-month processing times will invariably characterize a peer-reviewed journal. All we can do is to try to keep those cases to a minimum.

IV. GIVING CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

Though not requested by the Publications Committee, I feel compelled to close this report with some notes of thanks. First, I am grateful to my outstanding assistants: TAR Editorial Assistant Mary Capps and University of Texas at Austin accounting doctoral student (and TAR Research Assistant) Tracie Majors. Mary, Tracie and I meet every weekday at 2:00 p.m. to discuss that day’s workflow (and any “fires” that need extinguishing). They work tirelessly, and their work never ends. I could not do this job without them.
Second, I would like to thank my co-editors, Shannon Anderson, Harry Evans, Jim Hunton, Kathryn Kadous, Sanjay Kallapur, Ranjani Krishnan, Laureen Maines, Paul Newman, Tom Omer, Wayne Thomas, Mark Trombley, Beverly Walther, and Paul Zarowin. I believe (and I hope they agree) that I have developed 13 valued friendships through my associations with these outstanding professionals, and I am tremendously grateful for their willingness to help me share the load. There is no possible way that I could reach 719 decisions in a year on my own.

Third, I would like to thank TAR’s Editorial Advisory and Review Board, as listed in the inside cover material of each issue. They carry the lion’s share of the review workload (each generally completing six and often more reviews per year), and they usually do so with a smile, even if a TAR editor is forced in the awkward position of rejecting a Board member’s paper one day and requesting a review from that same Board member the next day. I am inspired by the constructiveness and professionalism of these outstanding scholars. Proving that no good deed goes unpunished, that is why they get so many review requests.

Fourth, even with 124 Editorial Board members, TAR could not possibly manage (certainly not with a two-reviewer system) without the extensive assistance of ad hoc reviewers. These reviewers are the unsung heroes of the process, and they too often go unthanked. Accordingly, I am listing them by name, and it is my intent to do so each year I submit this report. Please see Appendix B for the many well-qualified experts who have served as ad hoc reviewers from June 1, 2008 to May 31, 2009. TAR owes them a huge debt of gratitude.

Fifth, I wish to thank former TAR Senior Editor Dan Dhaliwal and his co-editors, both for their dedicated service to the AAA, and for making the editorial transition smooth and straightforward. I also wish to thank former Editorial Assistant Gail Fey for teaching us the
“system.” All members of the former regime have been very helpful and cooperative throughout the process.

Finally, on a personal note, I would like to thank Paula, my wonderful wife of 25 years (and counting). As I am typing this paragraph, I see that the evening hours have arrived (on a Friday evening no less), but Paula will understand, and she will also understand why I have to write decision letters on Saturday and Sunday instead of installing the deck lighting I promised her two (she says three) months ago. I also want to thank my three super daughters, Karen, Nicole, and Sara, for being equally understanding. Karen and Nicole are both undergraduates at the University of Texas at Austin (they live in the dorms), and they are kind enough to have lunch with Dad once a week to give me some relief from the emails. My 14-year-old Sara lives at home, and like her Mom, is so understanding when Dad gets behind due to that “magazine” he has to do. I take my TAR responsibilities very seriously, but my family helps to keep me from taking myself too seriously. It is helpful for all involved in the process – authors, reviewers, and editors – to remind ourselves from time to time that accounting research does not exactly cure cancer. If journals publish interesting research that facilitates a richer understanding of accounting and more effective accounting education, that is all we can ask. But there are more important things in life, such as family. Next week I am taking mine to the Great Smoky Mountains for a few days of tent camping, rest, relaxation, and fun. This family time will undoubtedly delay some decision letters for a week or so, but I hope the authors understand.
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Chart 1
Histogram of Editorial Rounds and Outcomes
Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009

Panel A: First-Round Outcomes (New Submissions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances and Conditional Acceptances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject - Contribution</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject - Validity</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel B: Second-Round Outcomes (First Revisions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances and Conditional Acceptances</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject - Contribution</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject - Validity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel C: Third- and Fourth-Round Outcomes (Second and Third Revisions)

Chart 1, Histogram of Editorial Rounds and Outcomes for the Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009, continued
Table 1
Annual Activity Summary

Panel A: Activity for the Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts in Process on June 1, 2008</th>
<th>New Submissions Received after June 1, 2008</th>
<th>Resubmissions Received after June 1, 2008</th>
<th>Manuscripts Available for Evaluation</th>
<th>Decision Letters Sent</th>
<th>Manuscripts in Process on May 31, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c) has (d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations of Columns:

(a) Manuscripts in process include all new submissions and revisions pending decision (generally awaiting review), but exclude manuscripts awaiting revision from authors.
(b) New manuscripts, excluding resubmissions of revised manuscripts.
(c) Resubmissions of invited revisions.
(d) Summation of columns (a), (b), and (c).
(e) Completed decision letters represent 646 unique manuscript files and 73 subsequent decisions of manuscripts previously evaluated as a “revise and resubmit” decision within the same fiscal year.
(f) Manuscripts awaiting review and/or editorial decision as of May 31, 2009.

Panel B: New Submissions by Calendar Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>New Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2  
Annual Outcome Summary for the Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Letters Sent (a)</th>
<th>Rejections (b)</th>
<th>Revise and “Uncertain” Decisions (c)</th>
<th>Acceptances and Conditional Acceptances (d)</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate 1: ( \frac{d}{(b)+(d)} )</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate 2: ( \frac{d}{(a)} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations of Columns:

(a) This column is the same as column (e) of Table 1, Panel A, reflecting all decision letters sent during the fiscal year, including 73 decisions on manuscripts that had already been evaluated previously within the same fiscal year (with invitation to revise and resubmit). Thus, the 719 decisions reflect 646 unique manuscript files.

(b) Rejections include 259 rejections due primarily to insufficient contribution and 149 rejections due primary to a perceived threat to the validity of the reported claims.

(c) The 230 total revision decisions include 73 revisions that were subsequently resubmitted and logged again as a separate decision within the same fiscal year (see note for column (a) above). Of the 230 total revisions, 166 were logged as standard “revise-and-resubmit” decisions and 64 were logged as “uncertain” decisions that allow but do not necessarily encourage resubmission.

(d) Of the 81 decisions logged as acceptances or conditional acceptances, 65 were published in Volume 84 of *The Accounting Review* (i.e., calendar 2009). Both totals exclude four invited commentaries.
### Table 3
Submissions and Acceptances by Subject Area and Research Method
Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009

**Panel A: Submissions and Acceptances by Subject Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Subject Area</th>
<th>Submissions Representing Unique Manuscript Files with Decisions (b)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Submissions (c)</th>
<th>Acceptances and Conditional Acceptances (d)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Acceptances (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental and Not-for-Profit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>646</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanations of Columns:**

(a) Subject (Panel A) and method (Panel B) categories are as directed by the AAA Publications Committee. Manuscripts that overlapped categories were assigned to the category best capturing the study’s primary objective, as judged by the Senior Editor.

(b) This column reflects the 646 unique manuscript files obtained by taking the 719 editorial decisions during the fiscal year as tallied in Table 1, Panel A and subtracting the 73 revise-and-resubmit decisions on manuscripts for which a subsequent decision was logged within the same fiscal year on the same file, thereby avoiding double counting of categories for the same manuscript files.

(c) This column represents the entry in Column (b) divided by 646 unique manuscript files.

(d) This column reflects the 81 acceptance and conditional acceptance decisions reached on the 646 unique manuscript files in Column (b).

(e) This column represents the entry in Column (d) divided by 81 acceptances and conditional acceptances.
Table 3, Submissions and Acceptances by Topic and Method, Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009, continued

Panel B: Submissions and Acceptances by Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Research Method</th>
<th>Submissions Representing Unique Manuscript Files with Decisions (a)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Submissions (b)</th>
<th>Acceptances and Conditional Acceptances (c)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Acceptances (d)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Acceptances (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical-Archival</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field and Case Study</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations of Columns:

See explanations for Panel A, above.

Panel C: Submissions and (Acceptances) by Topic Crossed with Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject and Method</th>
<th>Auditing</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Taxation</th>
<th>All Other Subjects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>8 (2)</td>
<td>24 (5)</td>
<td>14 (3)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
<td>54 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical-Archival</td>
<td>87 (13)</td>
<td>284 (28)</td>
<td>35 (5)</td>
<td>29 (4)</td>
<td>41 (3)</td>
<td>476 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>34 (3)</td>
<td>24 (3)</td>
<td>20 (3)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>89 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Methods</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>27 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132 (19)</td>
<td>337 (38)</td>
<td>82 (13)</td>
<td>35 (5)</td>
<td>60 (6)</td>
<td>646 (81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cell entries reflect submissions first, then acceptances (in parentheses). The top row for each cell indicates raw counts. The bottom row computes percentages of the 646 total unique submissions and 81 total acceptances, respectively, rounded to the nearest whole percentage to enable the table to fit in the available space.
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Table 4
Author Affiliation

Panel A: Universities and Other Institutions Represented in Volume 84 (Calendar 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Affiliation</th>
<th>Number of Published Articles (Vol. 84, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Management University</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The George Washington University</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin – Madison</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Carlos III de Madrid</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt University – Berlin</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University at St. Louis</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Univ. of Science and Technology</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maastricht University</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri – Columbia</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel A continued on next page.
Table 4, Author Affiliation, continued

Panel A, Universities and Other Institutions Represented in Volume 84, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Affiliation</th>
<th>Number of Published Articles (Vol. 84, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentley University</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goethe University</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Antwerp</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEC Paris</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meijo University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaka University of Economics</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel A continued on next page.
Table 4, Author Affiliation, continued

Panel A, Universities and Other Institutions Represented in Volume 84, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Affiliation</th>
<th>Number of Published Articles (Vol. 84, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman University</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian School of Business</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul National University</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays Global Investors</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen Business School</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Center - Herzliya</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Panel A reports author affiliations for the 65 refereed articles published in Volume 84 of *The Accounting Review*, excluding four invited commentaries. For articles written by k coauthors, the table allocates 1/k of an article to each coauthor's affiliation. For authors indicating two affiliations, that author’s 1/k share is allocated equally to both affiliations.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submissions Representing Unique Manuscript Files with Decisions</th>
<th>Acceptances and Conditional Acceptances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Institutions</td>
<td>483.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U.S. Institutions</td>
<td>162.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Panel B reports data for authors’ affiliations, allocating 1/k of each manuscript to each of k coauthors. Submissions data reflect the 646 unique files obtained by taking the 719 editorial decisions during the fiscal year as tallied in Table 1, Panel A, and subtracting 73 revise-and-resubmit decisions on manuscripts for which a subsequent decision was logged within the same fiscal year on the same file, thereby avoiding double counting of the same manuscript files. Acceptance data reflect all 81 acceptances and conditional acceptances reached in the journal year ending May 31, 2009, including acceptances reserved for publication in 2010.
Table 5  
Processing Time from Date of Submission to Date of Sending the Decision  
Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009

Panel A: All 719 Decisions Reached in the Journal Year Ending May 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processing Time</th>
<th>Number of Manuscripts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Number of Manuscripts</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 30 days</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 60 days</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 90 days</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 – 120 days</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 121 days</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean processing time: 81 days.  
Median processing time: 81 days.  

Panel B: Decisions on All Submissions Received from June 1, 2008 – May 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processing Time</th>
<th>Number of Manuscripts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Number of Manuscripts</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 30 days</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 60 days</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 90 days</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 – 120 days</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 121 days</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean processing time: 73 days.  
Median processing time: 79 days.  

Note:  
Panel B excludes 133 in-process post-June 1, 2008 decisions on manuscripts that were submitted before June 1, 2008, the first day of the new editorial regime.
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Note: This Appendix reproduces the content of the Review Form TAR sends with each review request. To save space, the material below is not the literal form, as the electronic form provides buttons to check one of the recommendation options (page 1) and spaces for written answers to the open-ended questions (page 2). However, the questions asked on the form are exactly as indicated below.

This form summarizes information that would ordinarily be conveyed in a cover letter to the editor, and hence eliminates the need for a separate cover letter.

1. Overall recommendation: Please select the category that best captures your recommendation to the editor.

○ CONDITIONAL ACCEPT: The manuscript’s incremental contribution is sufficient to warrant consideration for publication in The Accounting Review, subject to satisfactorily addressing any suggestions/concerns in the review report.

○ REVISE AND RESUBMIT: Significant concerns raise doubt about the manuscript’s incremental contribution, but the study offers a reasonable potential that those concerns could be remedied in a diligent revision.

○ UNCERTAIN: Significant concerns raise doubt about the manuscript’s incremental contribution, and it is unclear whether even a diligent revision could remedy those concerns. NOTE: This category provides the least guidance to the editor and author(s), and hence should be used only in (ideally rare) cases in which it is genuinely unclear whether the manuscript offers sufficient potential to warrant an invitation to revise and resubmit.

○ REJECT DUE TO INSUFFICIENT CONTRIBUTION: The manuscript’s incremental contribution is of insufficient magnitude to warrant publication in The Accounting Review, and likely cannot be made sufficient short of a new study (as opposed to a revision of the current effort).

○ REJECT DUE TO VALIDITY THREAT: Significant concerns threaten the validity of the claimed contribution, and addressing those concerns would effectively require a new study (as opposed to a revision of the current effort).
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2. In one or two sentences, please summarize the primary contribution made by the study under review.
   <Space provided.>

3. In one or two sentences, please summarize the most important concern with this manuscript.
   <Space provided.>

4. Please use this space for any other information you wish to convey directly to the editor.
   <Space provided.>

Thank you for reviewing this manuscript. *The Accounting Review* cannot succeed without the help of dedicated expert reviewers, and we are most appreciative for your willingness to serve in this capacity.
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