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Abstract
[Excerpt] In 2016, Cornell Hospitality Quarterly (CQ) received 280 new submissions with 271 receiving editorial decisions within the year. Twenty-five submissions were accepted for publication last year. Some of the new submissions are still under invited revision and some of the acceptances were of manuscripts originally submitted in 2015, so dividing 25 by 271 to get an acceptance rate is not fully appropriate, but it does provide a reasonable approximation of the journal’s acceptance rate. By that calculation, CQ’s acceptance rate is 9%. Other, more complicated but arguably more appropriate calculations put the journal’s acceptance rate at 10%. Seventy-five percent of submissions were desk-rejected—usually within 3 days of submission. Of those new submissions sent out to review, the average time until initial editorial decisions was 31 days. No revisions and resubmissions (R&Rs) were sent back to the reviewers last year, so the average time until an editorial decision on R&Rs was less than 3 days. More details about last year’s submissions and editorial decisions are provided in Tables 1 and 2.
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Summary of CQ’s 2016 Submissions and Editorial Decisions

In 2016, *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* (CQ) received 280 new submissions with 271 receiving editorial decisions within the year. Twenty-five submissions were accepted for publication last year. Some of the new submissions are still under invited revision and some of the acceptances were of manuscripts originally submitted in 2015, so dividing 25 by 271 to get an acceptance rate is not fully appropriate, but it does provide a reasonable approximation of the journal’s acceptance rate. By that calculation, CQ’s acceptance rate is 9%. Other, more complicated but arguably more appropriate calculations put the journal’s acceptance rate at 10%. Seventy-five percent of submissions were desk-rejected—usually within 3 days of submission. Of those new submissions sent out to review, the average time until initial editorial decisions was 31 days. No revisions and resubmissions (R&Rs) were sent back to the reviewers last year, so the average time until an editorial decision on R&Rs was less than 3 days. More details about last year’s submissions and editorial decisions are provided in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1:**
Number (and Percentage) of Decisions on 2016 Submissions by Manuscript Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript Type</th>
<th>Total with Decision</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>R&amp;R</th>
<th>Conditional Accept</th>
<th>Accept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New submission</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>235 (86.7%)</td>
<td>30 (11.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1 (.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11 (28.9%)</td>
<td>7 (18.4%)</td>
<td>11 (28.9%)</td>
<td>9 (23.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>12 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:**
Summary Statistics for Number of Days Until Decision by Manuscript Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New submission</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk rejected</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent to reviewers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I could not have evaluated all these submissions, or achieved the turn-around times we did, without the help of numerous reviewers who provided timely and informative comments on the manuscripts sent to them. Thus, I want to publically thank the following people who provided reviews of CQ submission in 2016.

Abbruzzo, Antonio
Abrate, Graziano
Agmapisarn, Charoenchai
Ali, Imran
Anderson, Chris
Ariffin, Ahmad Azmi M.
Barber, Nelson
Barnes, Donald
Barnett, Michael
Becerra, Manuel
Berezina, Katerina
Beritelli, Pietro
Boateng, Agyenim
Boudry, Walter
Bowen, John
Brewster, Zachary
Chan, Elisa
Chiu, Ching-Ren
Chiu, Yung-ho
Chun, HaeEun
Clemes, Michael D.
Combs, Jim
de Roos, Jan
Eastman, Jacqueline
Falk, Martin
Ford, Robert
Gao, Wendy
Gao, Yixing Lisa
Giebelhausen, Michael
Gonzalez, Reyes
Green, Alison
Green, Melanie
Guchait, Priyank
Guo, Xiaolong
Hanks, Lydia
Hanson, Bjorn
Harris, Judy
Hirsch, Gary
HON, Alice H. Y.
Hsu, Cathy
Huan, Tzung-Cheng
Huang, Chien-jung
Huang, Jun
Jansen, Bernard J.
Jeon, Seongmin
Jiang, Fuming
Joshi, Ashwin
Joy, Annamma
Kalnins, Arturs
Karatepe, Osman M.
Kasavana, Michael
Khan, Mahmoud
Kim, Miran
Kim, Woo
Kimes, Sheryl
Kitapci, Olgun
Klausner, Adam
Ku, Edward
Kwok, Linchi
Kwortnik, Robert
LaTour, Kathryn
Law, Rob
Lawrence, Benjamin
Lee, Eun
Lee, Seok
Lipovetsky, Stan
Liu, Crocker
Liu, Fang
Liu, Hsin-Hsien
Loi, Raymond
Lu, Lu
Lucas, Anthony F.
Madera, Juan
Magnini, Vincent
Mahadevan, Renuka
Marco-Lajara, Bartolome
Martinez-Fernandez, Teresa
Mattila, Anna
Mauri, Aurelio
Moultton, Pamela
Mura, Paolo
Murphy, Jamie
Mussoni, Maurizio
Nicolau, Juan
Noone, Breffni
O’Connor, Peter
O’Neill, John
Perry, Jamie
Pitts, Robert
Pratt, Stephen
Promsivapallop, Pornpisanu
Ramon Medina-Munoz, Diego
Rasoolimanesh, Mostafa
Reynolds, Dennis
Rihova, Ivana
Rosenbaum, Mark
Saayman, Melville
Sampson, Scott
San Martin, Héctor
Sarwar, Abdullah
Scott, David
Sheel, Acul
Sheu, Chwen
Simons, Tony
Slough, Vincent
Smith, Melanie
So, Kevin Kam Fung
Steiner, Eva
Sturman, Michael
Suh, Eunjoo
Susskind, Alex
Tanford, Sarah
Tavitiyan, Pimtong
Tews, Michael
Torres, Edwin
Tracey, J.
Uhlener, Lorraine
Ukhov, Andrey
van Oest, Rutger
Wang, Chen-Ya
Wang, Shuo
Wong, Ip Kin
Xie, Karen
Xie, Xiaoping
Yang, Yanwu
Yoon, Hye Hyun
Zheng, Tianshu

Thank you to these reviewers and to the authors who submitted their manuscripts for consideration at Cornell Hospitality Quarterly (CQ) in 2016. I hope you continue to support the journal in 2017 and in the years to come.
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