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 (EDMA) – 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.

Each edition of JOI is organized around a specific theme. The theme is selected by the JOI Editorial Team based on members' interests and ongoing initiatives within EDMA. Themes featured in past editions have included Artificial Intelligence, Data Management, Digital Transformation, and Supply Chain.

Target Audience

JOI is available to all EDMA members and the public through access on EDMA websites (www.objectmanagementgroup.org and www.edma.org), as well as the established marketing channels of EDMA and its members.

Content

We are dedicated to identifying compelling, practical technical and management insights developed by technologists, business executives, academic scholars and influential thought leaders, and to publishing these new ideas to help businesses transform. To this end, we invite submissions from different perspectives, including business, usage, functional and implementation, that offer new ideas and insights about innovative technologies in industry.

JOI is designed to become a trusted and respected source of valuable information related to technology innovation in industry, guiding executives, technologists and business leaders. To achieve this objective, only articles of the highest caliber of scholarly, technical thought leadership will be accepted for publication.

Industry value should not be confused with a product pitch. Acceptable content that provides thought leadership and guidance to executives, technologists and business leaders will include, at a minimum:

- 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 Peer-Review 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 article will be sent to at least two peer-reviewers for evaluation and rating.

Once the submission is reviewed and approved by peer reviewers as described in the "Review Guide For Articles" section below, it will be assigned to two editors within the EDMA membership. The editors will work with the authors to review content and structure, and to confirm the article is consistent with the theme and goals of JOI.

From acknowledgement of receipt for peer review to publication-ready article, the process typically takes approximately three weeks to complete. The actual publishing date, however, may vary depending on the publication calendar.

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

The Peer Review Guidelines

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish a common understanding among authors and peer reviewers on how submissions will be evaluated and the characteristics of an acceptable article or paper. This approach is intended to promote consistency, effectiveness, and transparency in the peer-review process.

The peer reviewers remain anonymous to the authors throughout the review process. Peer review begins on the first business day following the deadline for final drafts for each JOI edition.

A thorough peer review requires a minimum commitment of two hours for the initial review, as well as additional time for follow-up reviews during the revision process. Authors will revise the manuscript in response to the peer reviewers' feedback and return the revised version for reassessment. This iterative process will continue until the reviewers agree that the article is ready for publication and can proceed to 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). A reviewed document submitted without a completed Ratings Table will not be considered as a completed peer review.

Please adhere to the subsequent guidelines during the review.

Document Requirements

- Full-length articles submitted to JOI should not exceed 5,000 words, including references, tables, and figures, but excluding the research methodology section. Shorter articles should be between 500 and 2,000 words, including references, tables, and figures.
- Every submission must:
    - Present a significant idea, technological breakthrough, innovative approach or new technique;

    - Include at least one relevant use case that illustrates the idea in practice; and
    - Identify the relevant business benefits associated with innovation
- The submission 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.
- All references must be qualified and relevant and the target for the article is to contain a minimum of 8 references with 2 references pointing to research articles (like the articles published by ACM or IEEE).
- Each article must support JOI's goal of educating and enabling businesses to seize on opportunities for revenue growth and improved operational efficiency by sharing innovative ideas, research and solutions along with practical advice.
- All articles must refrain from product promotion – product(s) may be referenced but not promoted.
- All diagrams/tables/images/figures that are not owned by the authors must be properly attributed and have permissions to use
- All footnotes must be reflected at the bottom of each related page
- Articles earning a rating of 2 or 3 in any evaluation category (see below) must be revised to address the issues that resulted in that rating. Authors may then resubmit the revised manuscript for reassessment and an opportunity to receive a higher rating. To be accepted for publication, a submission must receive a rating of 4 and 5 are required in every evaluation category.
- Articles receiving a rating of 1 in any category may be excluded from the JOI edition under review. If the JOI Editorial team determines that the issues leading to the rating are deemed to be rectifiable, the author may be given an opportunity to revise and resubmit. Any such revision must be completed within the originally established publication schedule; no additional time will be granted. The JOI Editorial Team will determine whether to proceed with further revision and peer review or to exclude the article from the targeted edition.

Responsible Use of AI in Submitted Articles

Reviewers should evaluate submissions for compliance with JOI's responsible-AI requirements. Specifically, reviewers should assess that:

- AI has not been used as a primary author and has not generated full paragraphs, sections, or drafts;
- AI-generated facts, claims, or references are not present unless independently verified by the authors;
- AI-assisted content (editing, ideation, structure suggestions) is acceptable only if the conceptual and analytical work clearly originates from the human authors;
- AI-generated images or diagrams are only acceptable when the underlying data is author-provided and rights are clearly documented; and
- AI use is properly disclosed in the Statement of Originality.

If reviewers suspect improper AI use, they should flag it under Quality of Contribution, Quality of Contents, and Quality of Presentation, and recommend revision or rejection depending on severity.

Characteristics of an Acceptable Article:

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

Quality of Subject: The specific problems or issues investigated by the article must be meaningful and substantive and are not artificial or contrived. They should have some technical significance to warrant investigation. In addition, the subject must be aligned with the theme of the targeted JOI edition and be relevant to the interest of OMG/EDMA readership;

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 provided for peer review will include a blank Ratings Table (see below) at the end of the document. Reviewers should evaluate the article against each of the four characteristics described above and assign a rating from 1 to 5 for each characteristic. The completed Rating table should include the four separate ratings, suggestions for improvement where appropriate, and overall comments.

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:		

In addition to completing the Rating Table, reviewers are encouraged to provide comments and suggested edits directly in the article utilizing Microsoft Word's Track Changes and Comment features to help improve the overall quality.

Review Guide for Articles

Instructions to Reviewers

Please evaluate the article according to the following four criteria along with their scoring guidelines. For each criterion, provide (1) comments explaining the assigned score and (2) whenever possible, specific suggestions for improving the article so that it may achieve a higher score after revision.

	Quality of Subject: Significance and relevance, Interest to readers
1 (Unfit)	The subject is trivial, artificial, poorly conceived, or not meaningfully relevant to the theme of the targeted JOI edition. It addresses a topic of little significance to JOI's target readership or lacks sufficient technical, business, or industry relevance to warrant publication. It shows significant signs of AI-generated generalities, hallucinated claims, or questionable terminology. The topic may reflect machine-constructed framing rather than genuine industry insight.
2 (Deficient)	The subject is somewhat relevant to the theme of the targeted JOI issue, but the treatment is generally familiar, obvious, generic, or insufficiently developed. The chosen approach demonstrates limited novelty, depth or value. The framing seems to have relied on AI-assisted ideation without sufficient human refinement, resulting in generic or superficial problem statements. Assumptions or projected outcomes may be inadequately supported or reflect AI-generated

	summaries rather than human analysis. The topic is only partially aligned to the theme for the targeted JOI edition.
3 (Marginal)	The subject is marginally meaningful and suitable for JOI. The findings may offer some useful insight but are not deep or broad enough to attract reasonably wide interest from JOI's target readership. Minor signs of AI-assisted phrasing or structure may appear, but human authorship is evident.
4 (Acceptable)	This subject presents timely and meaningful industry experiences, real-world findings, or innovative ideas. The potential impact is evident. The subject aligns well with the theme of the targeted JOI's edition and is likely to be of strong interest to JOI's target readership.
5 (Valuable)	This subject addresses significant, well-known challenges within the theme of the edition, or identifies new trends or opportunities relevant to that theme. There is clear evidence that the specific subject of this article is significant and innovative. The topic is highly aligned with the theme of the targeted JOI issue and is likely to attract broad interest among JOI's target readership.

	Quality of Contribution: Originality, Innovation Level and Potential Impact
1 (Unfit)	This article has misconceived the problem or 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. Key ideas appear AI-generated, derivative, or fabricated, or the work represents routine output. AI-generated facts or references that are inaccurate or fabricated render the contribution invalid.
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 also questionable, possibly reflecting AI-generated reasoning that authors did not validate. Some experiences or recommendations are presented but they lack uniqueness and/or insights, or 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. Some AI-assisted elements may be present but are clearly secondary to human reasoning. However, the 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 regarding its results. The information presented in the article is valuable and can serve as useful guidance.
5 (Valuable)	This article presents innovative solutions, original experiences, or concrete results address a real challenge. The article's contributions constitute best practices and are likely to have a positive effect.

	Quality of Contents: Technical depth and scientific rigorousness
1 (Unfit)	The article reads like a routine report and lacks of sufficient technical depth, analytical content, and sound judgments. It may contain major errors, AI-generated hallucinations, fabricated references, or unverifiable claims. Alternatively, the article may contain major errors which render its findings invalid.
2 (Deficient)	This article primarily presents what was done or experienced in a project. It is essentially a restatement of facts and actions with few explanations of the information presented or justifications for the conclusions. Some reasoning may appear AI-generated or insufficiently verified. Alternatively, significant technical errors may be identified.
3 (Marginal)	This article has demonstrated some levels of scientific rigor in supporting its findings, such as through sound case studies and experimental results. It includes some useful analysis and discussions. The contents are technically correct. There are some technical aspects requiring clarification or improvement, which can be addressed through revision. Minor AI-assisted phrasing may be present but does not undermine correctness of the article.
4 (Acceptable)	This article has clearly demonstrated the usefulness of its contents and contributions to the theme. The contents are technically sound and only a few remaining issues to be addressed.
5 (Valuable)	In addition to meeting the criteria for Score 4 above, the article offers a convincing approach to a challenge and documents supporting research.

	Quality of Presentation: Clarity and effectiveness of text & illustration
1 (Unfit)	The article's goal, ideas or technical/business contents are very difficult to understand possibly due 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. In addition, writing shows signs of AI-generated repetition, unnatural phrasing, or inconsistent terminology.
2 (Deficient)	The article's content can be understood with some effort. Poor writing, unnecessary complex mathematics, excessive jargon, or inadequate illustrations may prevent readers from gaining an adequate understanding or evaluation of the article's content. Some sections may contain AI-style generic phrasing or filler, suggesting over-reliance on AI editing without human refinement.
3 (Marginal)	The article presents its materials adequately. For example, the contents can be followed generally by readers, key concepts can be identified, the technical descriptions can be generally understood, and the illustrations meet basic requirements. However, there are clearly identifiable places for improvements, such as overly complicated sentences, a significant amount of misspelling or grammatical mistakes, improper word usage, crowded charts, or similar issues. Alternatively, the article's readability can be significantly improved by re-

	arranging some materials. Some AI-assisted editing may be evident but does not impede readability.
4 (Acceptable)	The article presents its material well, and knowledgeable readers can understand most details without extensive effort. The innovative aspects and their potential values can be easily recognized. Illustrations provide effective support in helping readers understand the article.
5 (Valuable)	The article is presented in a professional manner without significant presentation flaws. Appropriate references, especially on relevant prior work, are included. Readers familiar with the subject area of the article may find the article concise, visually appealing, and enjoyable to read.

More information

Journal of Innovation was originally produced by the Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC), which later became part of the Object Management Group (OMG), and subsequently transitioned to EDM Association (EDMA) in 2025.

Visit our websites to learn more about JOI and to access past articles:

- EDMA Journal of Innovation Webpage
- OMG Journal of Innovation Archive – *for past articles from 2015-2025*

For additional questions, please contact:

- Karen Quatromoni at karen@omg.org
- Our Member Services team at membersupport@edmcouncil.org

Or visit our "Contact Us" webpage at https://edmcouncil.org/contact/