

Dear *SMJ* Reviewer:

We have received a manuscript submission that seeks to replicate an earlier study using different data. *SMJ* welcomes and publishes well-executed replications of this type, as explained in the November 2016 Special Issue on Replication. We greatly appreciate your willingness to consider reviewing this paper.

Reviewing replication papers is obviously different from reviewing typical *SMJ* papers. It requires attention to some different issues that are specific to replications. In particular, we ask that you think about whether and how the study aids in building a cumulative body of knowledge within our field.

Beyond this general consideration, we ask that you consider the following points in your review:

1. We seek to publish replications of central or important results within, or highly relevant to, the field of strategic management. The paper should make clear the importance to strategic management of the study being replicated.
2. All replication papers need to include a replication of at least one study. Some papers may replicate more than one study. A paper that provides evidence regarding a proposition in prior literature but does not replicate a specific prior study is not a replication paper and should instead be evaluated as a standard *SMJ* paper.
  - a. The replication should use the same statistical model specification and variables (or as close as possible) as the original paper.
  - b. The data sample should be of equal or higher quality than the original. It is difficult to add to a body of knowledge if the replication uses a sample that contains more missing data, errors, etc.
  - c. Provided the prior point is satisfied, we are open to samples from different contexts such as a different country, size or type of firm, time period, industry, etc. It is preferable that the context of the sample in the replication study differs from the context in the original study in only one dimension. For example, if a replication study uses a sample in a different industry than the original paper, it is best to begin with data from the same time period, country, type of firm, etc. Or if the sample in the replication study covers a different time period than the original study, it is best to begin with the same industry, country, type of firm, etc. Then the paper can sequentially vary other elements of the sample, e.g., by adding more industries, years, etc. The goal is to clearly isolate which, if any, elements of the sample may lead to different results in the replication and the original study.
  - d. Papers should report the results of the original study to facilitate comparison with the replication.
  - e. Please note any shortcomings in the replication of the original study.

3. Some papers will go beyond this replication and use alternative methods or measures. For example, statistical analyses may change the model specification, including the functional form of the model (and associated estimation method) and/or the variables.
  - a. These changes should unambiguously improve on the original methods or measures.
  - b. These results are best reported so that each change in specification is shown individually first, before combining the changes. This will help in identifying why particular results do or do not replicate.
4. Replication results may be consistent or inconsistent with the original paper. We are interested in both. Replications need not find different results than the original study to be publishable.
5. Replication studies should conform to *SMJ*'s guidelines for empirical research, which state that: *SMJ* no longer accepts papers for publication that report or refer to cutoff levels of statistical significance (p-values). In statistical studies, authors should report either standard errors or exact p-values (without asterisks) or both, and should interpret these values appropriately in the text. Rather than referring to specific cutoff points, the discussion could report confidence intervals, explain the standard errors and/or the probability of observing the results in the particular sample, and assess the implications for the research questions or hypotheses tested. *SMJ* also now requires in papers accepted for publication that authors explicitly discuss and interpret effect sizes of relevant estimated coefficients.
6. A replication paper may be shorter than a standard journal paper, because the original study can be summarized rather than explained at length. Clearly the reader will need enough information to understand the point and approach taken in the replication, but a replication paper should not include a long discussion of the conceptual motivation of the original paper. It is, however, important to clearly explain the methods, data, and variables in the original study and in the replication, as well as in any extensions.
7. Replication papers do not need to contribute to theory directly. However, papers should consider implications for future research on the topic of the replicated study.
8. A single empirical study can neither prove nor disprove any general claim. A single replication study adds more information, but it too can neither prove nor disprove anything. Replication studies should take a factual and measured tone in reporting results.
9. The *SMJ* Co-editors' and the Guest Editors' introductions to the *SMJ* Special Issue on Replication provide further discussion of and guidelines toward high quality replications in strategic management.

In addition to the guidelines above, your general and specific comments to the authors should cover other issues common to all *SMJ* paper submissions. Your overall judgment on the suitability of a new submission or progress of a revision is greatly valued.