

EJKM: 2025 State of the Journal

Scott Erickson¹ and Helen Rothberg²

¹Ithaca College, NY, USA

²Marist College, NY, USA

gerickson@ithaca.edu

hnrothberg@aol.com

<https://doi.org/10.34190/ejkm.23.1.4009>

An open access article under [CC Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Two-years in as editors-in-chief of the *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management (EJKM)*, we continue to make progress in establishing the journal as a quality outlet for contemporary knowledge management research. We've seen some fine work published this year and believe we've made progress in improving the administrative processes as well.

Once again, thanks to everyone at ACI making the editing job easier, particularly Karen Harris who actually does most of the work. It's a pleasure to work in such an efficient, error-free environment.

The metrics show the journal received 189 submissions in 2024, up sharply from the 84 received in 2023. That's healthy but also a bit misleading as quite a number of these submissions were not really on topic and so were desk rejections. It's not entirely clear what's behind that trend but once misguided submissions are removed, the rate of submissions is still looking good and trending up.

EJKM accepted 13 submissions in 2014, on par with 2013's 14 acceptances. 170 submissions were declined. As always, submissions, acceptances, and rejections don't necessarily match up by calendar year, so the numbers don't add up to the 189 submissions. Also, as just noted, quite a number of submissions were desk rejections (160) with 10 others rejected after entering the reviewing process. The acceptance rate declined to 7% from 10%. As might be expected, the desk reject rate went up (72% to 89%) while the after-review reject rate went down (10% to 4%). The out-of-whack submission numbers make the results hard to evaluate precisely, but everything seems to be heading in the right direction. We were able to prioritize attention on the best submissions, allowing us to be respectful of reviewers' and authors' time. Days to accept declined markedly, from 259 days to 175 days, as did days to reject (37 days to 7 days). Only the latter should have been impacted by the large number of desk rejects.

The journal published two issues in 2024, down from three issues in 2023 but the first issue of 2025 is already rolling out. The difference is just a matter of timing when accepted articles are ready to publish, the difference does not indicate an overall drop in quality articles. *EJKM* continues to draw from a broad range of locations around the globe. Countries represented included not only Europe (Italy, Sweden, Poland, Austria, Finland) but also Asia (Indonesia twice, Vietnam), Africa (Ghana, South Africa), and North America (Canada, USA). And there are no formal numbers to support the feeling, but it seems from conversations with some authors that we might be publishing more articles from young scholars, completing or newly out of doctoral programs. If the work is good, we welcome it and hope so see more fine work in the future.

A couple of more opinionated comments again this year. We continue to see a good number of structural equation models (SEM) in submissions. As those are a focus of a lot of current work and the emphasis of many researchers' training, good SEM articles are always welcome. Authors looking to publish such methodologies, however, would save themselves and reviewers a lot of time if they take care to fully conceptualize their variables with specific references to the literature. SEM methods depend on scales which are combined into the concepts of interest. Often, the scales are sourced from the literature, showing they have already been successfully applied and reviewed. That's good. But too often, there is no theoretical development of the scales, just the reference to the previous study.

When putting together an SEM, the authors are making a choice on how to best conceptualize each of those variables. The scale used is one way to do it and contains specific items that the scale-maker drew from the literature (e.g. the tacit knowledge concept might be formed by items on learning-by-doing, sharing with colleagues, hands-on demonstrations, etc.). A full literature review would note that these types of items encompass what we know about tacit knowledge and so should be included in any conceptualization of the idea.

The scale-maker presumably went to that trouble, the author borrowing the scale should at least acknowledge previous work on the concept to that degree. Further, the author has chosen that scale and that conceptualization. There are usually other options. So a full literature review and conceptualization encompasses acknowledging existing knowledge on what we know about the concepts and specifics on why the author chooses to represent it in this particular way for this particular study. A passing reference to a scale and a minimal literature review will not pass scrutiny in the reviewing process.

Relatedly, and we've seen a bit of discussion among reviewers this year, a question exists about the timeliness of sources. While submissions should be up-to-date, it's also important to recognize the scholars who originally established a concept or made a key finding. One should not be writing about tacit vs. explicit knowledge without mentioned Nonaka & Takeuchi or one of their connected papers. The fact that someone in a journal mentioned tacit knowledge last year is not a quality citation nor does it indicate the required deep understanding of the literature. At the same time, citing only the "classic" literature doesn't really get it done either. Scholars need to stay current (e.g. what has been published recently that has contributed to our understanding of tacit knowledge) so it is perfectly fair to ask for more recent citations if a paper is overly reliant on older literature. It's not one or the other, most quality literature reviews and conceptualizations will provide a balance between the originators of ideas and those who have made the most recent relevant contributions to our understanding.

External journal metrics show continuing improvement in our Scopus CiteScore, coming in at 3.0 for 2023, up from 2.5 in 2022. This level shows a positive, consistent trend from 0.8 in 2018. As always, please continue to read the journal and cite it when appropriate, especially in submissions. Everyone connected with the journal benefits from higher quality perceptions.

We look forward to continued growth in quality submissions. We welcome new reviewers, including those in or recently graduated from doctoral programs. More reviewers spread the work more widely, making everyone's life easier. If asked to review, it does help to let us know sooner rather than later about intentions to complete it (or not), and we always hope for a positive response. We do our best not to ask any more frequently than necessary, provide papers in areas of interest (if we know them), and to only put viable submissions out into the full review process.

Thanks for your continued support of the journal. We look forward to working with everyone in 2025 and into the future.

Editors-In-Chief

Helen & Scott