Journal of Innovation: Reviewer Guidelines

Objective

The goal of the *Journal of Innovation (JOI)* – originally produced by the Object Management Group (OMG), now part of EDM Association – is to educate and enable businesses to seize revenue generating and operational efficiency improving opportunities by sharing innovative ideas, research and solutions along with practical advice related to Industrial Internet.

Content

We are dedicated to finding compelling, guiding and directly applicable technical and management insights developed by technologists, business executives, academic scholars and influential thought leaders, and publish these new ideas. To this end, we invite submissions from different points of view (business, usage, functional and implementation) that offer new ideas and insights into the evolution, innovation, and transformative nature of these technologies.

The JOI is designed to support our goal to become a trusted and respected source of valuable information related to the evolution and innovation, guiding executives, technologists and business leaders. The content will include:

- Research-based, full-length articles and white papers that translate the best ideas and thoughtful insights into actionable knowledge for leaders and practitioners
- Shorter articles that deliver briefings of the latest in research, ideas and implementation.

The Editorial Process

Upon receipt of an article or white paper, the submission is reviewed by the JOI editorial team to ensure it meets the JOI guidelines and objectives. If accepted, the submission is sent out for peer review.

Once a submission is reviewed and approved by peer reviewers, it will be assigned to two editors within the OMG membership who will work with the author to review content and structure and confirm the article's consistency with the goals of the JOI.

This process, from acknowledgement of receipt for peer review to final article ready for publishing, typically takes approximately one month to complete. The actual publishing date however, may vary depending on the publication calendar.

All peer reviewers who complete their reviews in a timely fashion and following the Peer Review Guidelines below will be acknowledged in the edition of the Journal of Innovation in which their reviewed article is published.

The Peer Review Guidelines

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish a common understanding among the authors and peer reviewers on how an article or paper will be reviewed and the characteristics of an acceptable article or paper. This approach is expected to improve the consistency, effectiveness and transparency of the peer review.

The peer reviewers remain anonymous to the author as feedback is conveyed. The peer review process begins the first business day after the final drafts are due for each JOI edition.

A thorough peer review requires a minimum commitment of two hours for the initial review and varying amounts of follow-up time during the iterative process where the document is revised based on the peer reviewers' feedback and returned to the peer reviewers. The iteration process continues until the reviewers agree that the document is good enough for publication and it can proceed for final editing. The review takes the form of a document with a new filename, edited in-line using the Track Changes and Comments features of MS Word and a completed Ratings Table (explained below). Reviewed documents without a completed Ratings Table do not qualify as a completed peer review.

Please adhere to the subsequent guidelines in the course of your review.

Document Requirements

- The article must offer a new idea or insight(s) into the evolution, innovation, and transformative nature of the theme of the edition.
- It does not have to be perfect (especially for an article or paper describing a completely new concept). Therefore, if an article or paper has adequate contributions, is technically sound, and does not mislead readers, it should be favorably rated.
- Articles and papers earning a rating of 2 or 3 in any category will require revision to address the issue(s) that led to the rating of 2 or 3. The author(s) have an opportunity to revise and earn a higher rating. Ratings of 4 and 5 are required in all categories for publication.
- Articles and papers earning a rating of 1 in any category will be considered for omission from the edition of the JOI under review. If the issue(s) leading to a rating of 1 are deemed to be rectifiable by the JOI editorial team, the author is given the opportunity to revise and resubmit, but without any additional time than the originally advertised deadlines. The JOI editorial team decides whether to pursue a revision with the author and peer reviewers or to omit the article from the targeted edition.

Characteristics of an Acceptable Article:

An article will be evaluated based upon the following four characteristics:

Quality of Subject: The specific problems/issues investigated by the article must be meaningful and are not artificial. They are expected to have some technical significance to

deserve investigation. In addition, the subject shall be relevant to the interest of OMG reader community;

Quality of Contribution: The article must contain original contributions that are innovative and have a potential impact to academic research, industry application or both;

Quality of Contents: The work conducted to support, validate, or demonstrate the article's claims with high degree of technical and scientific rigorousness, should be clearly articulated;

Quality of Presentation: The article's title, body and illustrations shall be able to communicate the contents effectively.

The recommended rating system is as follows:

1. Unfit
2. Deficient
3. Marginal
4. Acceptable
5. Valuable

Each article should be reviewed based on the four characteristics above and be assigned a rating of 1 to 5 for each characteristic. The final article will contain a table that will include four separate ratings, suggestions for improvement to reach a higher rating, and an overall comment section. In addition to the feedback summarized in the Rating Table, comments and edits are welcome in the body of the article (utilizing the MS Word Track Changes feature) to improve the overall quality of the article. The Rating Table will be included at the bottom of the reviewed document. A blank Rating Table will be inserted into the article to be reviewed, for the peer reviewers' use. It will look like this:

Rating Table:

Characteristic:	Rating:	Rationale for Rating and/or suggestions for improvement, if any
Quality of Subject		
Quality of Contribution		
Quality of Research		
Quality of Presentation		
Overall Comments:		

Please offer comments throughout the document as well as a summary comment, if necessary, within the table as above.

Review Guide for Articles and White Papers

Instruction to Reviewers

Please evaluate this article or paper according to the following four criteria along with their scoring guideline. It is important that you provide (1) comments to justify your score and (2) whenever possible, suggestions on how to improve the article or paper so that it can be scored higher after revision.

	Quality of Subject: Significance and relevance, Interest to readers
1 (Unfit)	This article does not represent an innovative idea, there is no solution offered to a challenge, it does not offer any best practices or practical advice, or it has very little to do with Industrial Internet. The article lacks basic evidence that it would appeal to target JOI readers.
2 (Deficient)	This article reflects the overall theme subject matter that is well known or easily understood and does not qualify as a new or innovative approach. Alternatively, the article lacks the proper support for the assumptions made or projected outcomes.
3 (Marginal)	The article's subject is marginally meaningful and suitable for consideration for the JOI. The findings may have some use but are not broad enough to attract reasonably wide interest from industry or academia.
4 (Acceptable)	This article presents industry experiences, real-world findings, or innovative ideas that are timely and meaningful. The potential impact is evident. The content is likely of interest to potential JOI readers.
5 (Valuable)	This article addresses well-known challenges faced within the theme of the edition or it identifies new trends or opportunities relevant to the theme of the journal. There is clear evidence that the specific subject of this article is significant and innovative.

	Quality of Contribution: Originality, Innovation Level and Potential Impact
1 (Unfit)	This article has misconceived the problem or has grossly simplified the issues such that its contributions become irrelevant or misleading; or, it represents essentially routine work. Alternatively, key ideas of the article have been previously published by the authors or by others.
2 (Deficient)	This article presents a potential solution to a challenge, but the methodology for implementing the solution is unclear or questionable. The innovative nature of the solution is questionable. Some experiences or recommendations have been presented but they lack uniqueness and/or insights, or they are so general that they are not actionable.

3 (Marginal)	This article presents an interesting solution to a known industry problem, useful findings that have not been reported before, or unique experiences. The information may be interesting and could be useful to others, but its usefulness is marginal, or has not been demonstrated in a convincing manner.
4 (Acceptable)	In addition to presenting innovative solutions or experiences, the article offers insights and sound judgments around its results. The information found within the article is valuable and can be referenced as guidance.
5 (Valuable)	This article presents innovative solutions, original experiences, or concrete results confronting a real challenge. The article's contributions constitute best practices and will have a positive effect.

	Quality of Contents: Technical depth and scientific rigorousness
1 (Unfit)	The article reads like a routine report and it has significant lack of technical depth, analytical components, and judgments. Alternatively, the article contains major errors which render its findings invalid.
2 (Deficient)	This article presents what has been done or experienced in a project. It is essentially a restatement of facts and actions. There are few explanations for the information or justifications for the conclusions. Alternatively some technical errors are identified. These concerns cannot be easily addressed through a revision.
3 (Marginal)	This article has demonstrated some levels of scientific rigor to support its findings, such as sound case studies and experimental results. There are some useful analysis and discussions. The contents are technically correct. There are some technical aspects requiring clarification or improvement, which can be addressed through a revision.
4 (Acceptable)	This article has clearly demonstrated the usefulness of its contributions to the theme. The contents are correct and there are few remaining issues to be addressed.
5 (Valuable)	In additional to the above (item 4), the article has offered a convincing approach to a challenge and documented the supporting research.

	Quality of Presentation: Clarity and effectiveness of text & illustration
1 (Unfit)	This article's goal, ideas or technical/business contents are very difficult to understand due possibly to 1) confusing organization of the materials; 2) overwhelming technical complexity; 3) illogical treatment of the subject; 4) excessively verbose descriptions; or 5) inept use of English language.

2 (Deficient)	This article's content can be understood with some effort. Poor written language, unwarranted complex mathematics, jargon, or coarse illustrations prevent a reader from gaining adequate understanding or evaluation of the article's contents.
3 (Marginal)	This article has presented its materials adequately, for example, the contents can be followed generally by the readers, the key concepts can be identified, the technical descriptions can be generally followed and the illustrations meet basic requirements. There are still easily identifiable places for improvements, such as overly-complicated sentences, significant amount of misspellings or grammatical mistakes, improper use of certain words, crowded charts, etc. Alternatively, the article's readability can be significantly improved by re-arranging some materials.
4 (Acceptable)	This article has presented its material well, as many details can be understood by knowledgeable readers without extensive effort. The innovative aspects and their potential values can be easily recognized. Illustrations provide good support for readers to understand the article.
5 (Valuable)	The article is prepared in a professional manner without identifiable presentation flaws. Appropriate references especially on relevant work are included. Readers familiar with the subject area of the article may find the article concise, visually pleasant, and enjoyable to read.

More information

Journal of Innovation highlights the innovative ideas, approaches, products, and services emerging across the information technology and digital transformation landscapes. It was originally produced by OMG (the Object Management Group), which became part of EDM Association in 2025.

Visit our websites to learn more and to access past articles. Our archives date back to 2015.

- Websites:
  - EDM Association
  - OMG Journal of Innovation – *for past articles from 2015-2025*
- "Contact Us" webpage:
  - https://edmcouncil.org/contact/
- Email – For additional questions, please contact:
  - Karen Quatromoni at karen@omg.org
  - Our Member Services team at membersupport@edmcouncil.org