

## **Editorial: On Submitting Economics Articles to JBV**

### **Abstract**

This editorial provides guidance to authors considering submitting papers with economics content to *Journal of Business Venturing*. The aim of the journal is to publish high-impact articles on entrepreneurship which combine methodological rigor with comprehensibility ('accessibility'). Since many economics articles are technically demanding, accessibility to non-technical readers can be a major challenge for authors. This editorial provides some advice for authors of such articles to make their articles more closely targeted on the core interests of the journal's readership and more accessible to non-technical readers. To this end, the editorial suggests that potential authors might benefit from adopting one of the following '3R' strategies: 'Remove', 'Reduce' or 'Relate'. It is hoped that this editorial provides useful and actionable guidance for economics researchers submitting theoretical and empirical papers to *Journal of Business Venturing*.

### **1. Introduction**

The *Journal of Business Venturing* (JBV) is a multi-disciplinary journal. It is committed to publishing original research about entrepreneurship regardless of disciplinary 'homes' and perspectives. There is no 'most favored' discipline or approach at the journal: JBV considers all articles on their merits without prejudice. To cope with the heterogeneity of manuscripts submitted to it, the journal employs field editors arrayed across several disciplinary areas. At the time of writing, these include digital, economics, finance & accounting, innovation,

international, management, marketing, organization theory, psychology, sociology, strategy and sustainability.

There are many strengths of JBV's disciplinary pluralism. One advantage is that the journal reduces the risk of excessive reliance on a handful of methodologies and perspectives, by recognizing that valuable insights can come from many different, and sometimes unexpected, places. This keeps the journal and its readership open to new thinking, ideas and methods – which in turn facilitates cross-field learning and cross-fertilization of ideas from numerous diverse sources. Of course, plurality does not come without its challenges: one danger is that a field can become too amorphous without a strong central core identity. Fortunately, entrepreneurship as a field has now attained a strong enough core (McMullen, 2019) to obviate concerns over identity confusion.

A different challenge arises from the possibility that some articles emanate from a 'home discipline' where conventions, jargon and mode of argumentation are difficult for readers trained in other disciplines to understand. This is common: consider, for example, some of the theoretical assumptions and conventions that psychologists take for granted – and which are alien to researchers grounded in innovation or finance. Most journal readers are usually willing to invest a little time to learn some of the basic conventions of a different discipline, especially when such effort is reciprocated by authors who take the trouble to present their material in an accessible manner. In these cases, the possibility of genuine cross-disciplinary communication is most apt to be realized. It is surely reasonable to expect both parties – authors and readers – to commit modest investments towards enhancing communication across disciplinary boundaries. What is not warranted by authors is to make

unreasonable demands of the reader by expecting them to invest deeply in learning about another disciplinary methodology.

Economics (which is taken hereafter to include financial economics) is a discipline where conventions, jargon and mode of argumentation are often specialized and technical. For example, economics theory papers often make assumptions about agent rationality, objectives, market competition, incentives and strategic interactions which are often neither obvious nor familiar to non-economists. Specialized jargon is often used to describe phenomena or frameworks which may be little known outside of academic economics. And the construction and solution of mathematical models, in which all agents optimize subject to specified information sets and exogenous constraints, can be difficult for non-technical readers to follow. This can deter even intelligent and well-read non-economists from investing the effort to understand the core arguments and results of technical economics papers. In contrast, it typically poses much less a problem for readers of economics journals, who are expected to possess the requisite training and familiarity with the conventions, jargon and mathematics used in economics. Consequently, submitting economics papers to economics journals is usually the most logical way of communicating new economic ideas to the scholarly community at large. That is quite apart from well-established career advantages of publishing within one's discipline, where the relevant journals are well known, and publications can be assessed and rewarded by one's peers.

But what if economists are studying entrepreneurship, and want to engage with an audience of entrepreneurship scholars rather than economists? JBV welcomes submissions from economists where entrepreneurship is at the core of their work. Indeed, it is fair to say that the journal prefers to see this work published in its own pages rather than in those of

economics journals. However, as a general interest entrepreneurship journal, JBV's requirements for the articles it seeks to publish differ in several important respects from those of economics journals. These differences have hitherto not been clearly articulated to prospective authors of JBV, resulting in numerous cursory rejections of such submissions with or without review.

Since this outcome is a poor use of authors', editors' and reviewers' time, it seems both appropriate and timely to furnish some guidelines to prospective authors of economics articles who are considering submitting their work to JBV. That is the purpose of the present editorial. Since JBV remains committed to publishing impactful economics articles which make a major contribution to entrepreneurship research, it seems appropriate first to clarify the differences between the publishing expectations of mainstream economics journals on one hand and entrepreneurship journals JBV on the other. Then, the editorial will outline some guidelines designed to help economists craft papers that will appeal to JBV's readership without compromising their own unique disciplinary perspective. Throughout, I will draw on papers published in JBV over the last decade to support and exemplify the points at hand.

It is worth noting at the outset that I will not discuss other disciplines and the communication problems that can arise for them. This is not to suggest that only economics submissions are vulnerable to these problems. Moreover, some of the suggestions that apply to authors of economics-flavored articles might also be applicable to authors from other disciplinary backgrounds. However, for maximum focus, economists are the main target audience for this editorial.

## **2. Publishing expectations in mainstream economics journals**

There follows a (necessarily) subjective interpretation of publishing expectations in economics journals. Economics journals are of course heterogeneous, so I will make some general observations which might not apply equally to all of them. I list four salient features of ‘typical’ published articles in these journals, relating to expectations about: what constitutes theory; data and methods; admissible contributions; and paper structure and style.

First, ‘mainstream’ economics journals have reached a high degree of agreement about what constitutes acceptable theory. The neoclassical paradigm remains a dominant force in the leading economics journals, though the number of behavioral economics and finance contributions has grown over the last two decades. Neoclassical theorists tend to assume that agents are rational and possess well-defined objectives and budget constraints. All relevant assumptions are clearly stated. Once the agents, their objectives, constraints, technology, and information sets are described, standard optimization methods are applied, and a toolkit of methods are deployed to solve for equilibrium outcomes. Behavioral economics theories tend to relax the full rationality assumption, allowing for the existence of cognitive biases; but once these are specified, they also enable optimization methods to be used to predict agent behavior and equilibrium outcomes. Economic theories of all stripes are often characterized by technical mathematical content, especially in high-prestige theory journals, where it is not uncommon to find advanced mathematics being used. Recently, however, some of the leading economics journals seem to have started to place a noticeably greater focus on accessibility, with technical details downplayed or relegated to online appendices. Accessibility of contributions appears to have become more salient in economics journals than it was at the start of this century.

Second, empirical articles appearing in economics journals often report results derived from the analysis of primary or secondary data: research designs are invariably quantitative in nature. The use of secondary data remains common, with sophisticated econometric methods applied to allay concerns about unobserved heterogeneity, sample selection and endogeneity. On the other hand, economists tend to rely more on single-item and proxy measures compared with management research, where a tight match between measures and constructs, and the use of multi-item measures based on validated scales, is expected.

Most notably, the top economics journals are increasingly emphasizing strong causal testing of economic and social phenomena, based on natural, field or laboratory experiments. Exemplary execution of randomized experiments seems to be displacing formal theory building in these journals; arguably, this work exhibits a higher level of sophistication and rigor than that published in many leading management journals. However, without a strong experimental design, it is becoming ever more difficult to publish empirical papers in top economics journals. It is possible that this trend is inducing economists who are still using secondary data to submit their work instead to leading multi-disciplinary journals like JBV.

Third, as in other disciplines, top-tier economics and finance journals seek to publish only major advances in knowledge; lower-tier journals are often willing to publish more incremental contributions. Even top-tier generalist and field journals are willing to publish papers that contribute to long-standing topics, some of which have long since ceased to be lively areas of research. Technically correct results are valued, even if they are of interest to a comparatively small audience of specialists; this is reflected in the relatively low citation impacts of many articles published in the more technical economics journals. A notable feature of empirical economics articles derives from the fact that economists generally agree

on what theory is, and what it would predict, for a problem in a specific context. Hence it is not uncommon for these papers to lack a formal theory section. This does not mean that theory is absent; rather, it means that it is often tacitly understood what economic theory would predict for the case at hand.

Fourth, most economics articles have the following structure. After an introduction and possibly a short literature review, theory papers tend to launch straight into a formal model, which is solved for an equilibrium, and whose implications for economic outcomes and public policy are then discussed. Empirical papers might skip a dedicated theory section altogether, focusing on the data, methods, and results. A third type of paper combines formal theory and empirical analysis. All three types of paper usually provide brief reviews of relevant prior published work and explain what they do in relation to that literature. A discussion or concluding section is also common to all three types of paper; but they are usually relatively brief.

### **3. Publishing expectations in JBV**

As above, I will start by discussing expectations about the role of theory at JBV, before moving on to data and methods, admissible contributions, and paper structure and style.

First, JBV does not publish purely empirical contributions. A more appropriate outlet for such submissions – provided they are about entrepreneurship – is its sister journal, *JBV Insights*. Empirical papers therefore require a theoretical underpinning. Consistent with the journal's broad disciplinary tent, a wide range of theoretical approaches are welcome in JBV – including, of course, economics. The most effective theoretical papers are those that are accessible, easy to read, and to the point. Theoretical underpinnings cannot be simply

assumed; they need to be clearly justified and articulated, usually in a dedicated section of the paper. The journal tends not to publish technical, mathematical and economic theory papers, though there are exceptions (see e.g. Fairchild, 2011; Arcot, 2014; Belleflamme et al., 2014; Norbäck et al., 2016; Hong, 2020). Papers comprising purely technical models that require substantial investment from the reader run the risk of deterring non-technical scholars from paying any attention to them at all. This is especially likely for submissions that make only minor extensions to a pre-existing economics model, since most readers of JBV are primarily interested in entrepreneurship, not in economics. Ideally, it should be possible for a non-specialist to be able to read a theory section and follow the gist of what is said, even if they do not understand every technical detail. Theoretical arguments usually culminate in testable hypotheses or propositions; but this is not a strict requirement.<sup>1</sup>

Some economists wonder what constitutes a ‘theoretical contribution’ at JBV. Ideally, a theoretical contribution should comprise a set of logical arguments, based on a set of premises, which culminate in a set of conclusions or predictions. What is not a theoretical contribution is a selective literature review chosen to give a slanted picture of what we know, interspersed with hypotheses that are consistent with said review.

Second, JBV expects data sources and sample framing to be clearly and carefully explained (Anderson et al., 2019). Variables and measures need to be justified and described in enough detail for the general reader to understand. There must be a close match between constructs and measures. Single item measures may be used; but authors are encouraged to use previously validated, multi-item scales where appropriate and available. Empirical

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g. Buchner et al. (2017) and Lee (2018) for examples of finance and economics papers respectively, published in JBV, which do not generate explicit hypotheses.

methods are rarely of interest in their own right: they are usually seen as means to an end; and methodological innovations are welcome but not expected. The primary purpose of empirical methods is to generate new knowledge for the benefit of entrepreneurship scholars, practitioners and/or policymakers. Papers making a purely methodological (e.g. statistical) improvement over current best practice are probably better suited to other journals that specialize in research methods.

Third, like other top-tier journals in other fields, JBV seeks to publish major advances in knowledge: it eschews incremental contributions. Articles published in JBV must be centrally about entrepreneurship and present a clear motivation at the start. Authors are encouraged to answer the “so what?” question: i.e. why does this research matter, to whom, and why? JBV also seeks contributions which join a lively ongoing conversation in the entrepreneurship field, and which will be of interest to a broad audience of entrepreneurship scholars. While conceptual and empirical results should be technically correct, technically correct results are generally not valued in and of themselves. They need to support an interesting narrative and contribution to knowledge about entrepreneurship.

Fourth, the structure of articles published in JBV tends to follow standard norms in management. For example, well written introductions clearly state the research question, why it matters, how it will be answered, and how the results will add to prior knowledge. Discussion sections tend to be comprehensive, typically comprising: a summary of the results; a set of implications for scholarship and possibly also practice; a discussion of limitations and potential for further research; and possibly also a brief conclusion to close. Authors are encouraged to peruse recent issues of JBV and be guided by the general structure of the articles published there, to obtain an accurate and timely idea of the journal “house style”.

Conforming to the house style aligns expectations between authors and reviewers and is generally associated with a more sympathetic review process.

#### **4. Advice for economists seeking to publish in JBV**

Comparing the previous two sections of this editorial reveals several areas of difference between economics and entrepreneurship journals like JBV. These differences motivate the following pieces of advice for economists contemplating submission of a paper to JBV.

##### *4.1. It should be centrally about entrepreneurship*

The core content of papers must appeal to scholars working in the entrepreneurship field, rather than just economists working on a niche area which happens to overlap with entrepreneurship. Consider for example the following two papers. The first, by Ardito et al. (2017), explored the effects of unemployment experiences on coronary heart disease. Ardito et al. (2017) adduced evidence that unemployed people who transition to self-employment have higher risks of coronary heart disease on average. The central interest of this paper was on the health impacts of the unemployment, not entrepreneurship, making a non-entrepreneurship journal an appropriate publication outlet. The second paper, by Nikolova (2019), also explored health impacts of switches into self-employment from unemployment and paid employment, with a central focus on the physical and mental health consequences of self-employment. Having entrepreneurship as its core concern, this paper was appropriate for consideration by JBV.

What this example shows is the importance of careful framing of the research question. Naturally, authors enjoy complete discretion about how to position a paper. The author chooses whether to make entrepreneurship, or some other issue, the central focus of

their paper; but once that choice is made, the potential suitability of any journal, including JBV, is largely determined. If an author chooses entrepreneurship for both research question and audience, JBV will likely be interested in receiving the paper for consideration. If on the other hand the author chooses some other focus and audience, JBV will be less appropriate as an outlet.

Of course, some topics are ‘close’ to entrepreneurship but distinct from it. Three examples are the economics of small businesses, firm size dynamics and Initial Public Offerings. There is no hard and fast rule regulating whether a paper on these topics is ‘sufficiently’ entrepreneurial or not to interest JBV. That judgement is ultimately down to the discretion of the Field Editor handling the paper. But a useful way for prospective authors to assess JBV’s suitability for a paper is to ask the following questions. First, does their paper contribute to an ongoing conversation in JBV and/or other leading entrepreneurship journals? Second, do they want the primary audience discussing their work to be entrepreneurship scholars? If the answers to both questions is ‘yes’, there is a fair chance their paper will be put out for peer review. If the answers are ‘no’, the chances are correspondingly lower.

Indeed, the list of bibliographic references at the end of a paper often provides a ‘quick and dirty’ way for authors to choose which type of journal, and which specific outlet, to submit to. Citations to articles recently published in a specific journal often suggest that journal as a suitable target, since a ready source of motivated reviewers are likely available; also, the journal editors have demonstrated current interest in the topic. Conversely, if the reference list contains no more than a few papers published in entrepreneurship journals, reviewers (and readers) are going to be harder to find, lengthening the review process and possibly leading to less helpful feedback for the authors. In these cases, the paper would likely

make a better fit with an economics or finance journal, and authors might do well to consider targeting those journals instead of JBV.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, there are also some ‘bad’ reasons to submit economics papers to JBV. Specifically, it should be stressed that JBV is not a place to submit an article just because it has not found a home in an economics journal. Economists who seek to publish a paper that has been rejected from economics journals in a multidisciplinary journal like JBV should not regard publishing in JBV as ‘easier’ than in a well-ranked economics journal. While it is true that economics journals are often more demanding in scrutinizing the validity of the data, the rigor of an experimental design, the appropriateness of statistical testing and the interpretation of results, JBV can be more demanding in terms of the positioning, the writing and the advancement of theory (qv section 3 above). Economists writing for JBV are advised to remember also that an entrepreneurship paper which has been rejected by an economics journal has already been reviewed by scholars with entrepreneurship interests, and it would be read at JBV by reviewers drawn from the same population. Hence, these two considerations of reviewer criteria (sections 2 and 3) and similar reviewer pools should discourage authors from submitting a rejected economics article to JBV without first undertaking a major repositioning of their work.

#### *4.2 It should be accessible to the readership of the journal: The ‘3Rs’*

Perhaps the best advice one can give to economists seeking to publish their work in JBV is to make their article as accessible as possible to the general reader. This does not absolutely preclude the inclusion of heavy technical content, which as noted earlier, JBV does sometimes

---

<sup>2</sup> While on the topic of citations, it should be emphasized that JBV does not encourage authors to cite prior work published in JBV or management journals for the sake of it. As a rule, only relevant citations should be included.

publish. But in general, purely technical material makes it hard for authors to reach a broad audience of entrepreneurship scholars, and so is deprecated. Citation impacts of these papers tend to be relatively low.<sup>3</sup>

Authors need to be clear about their objectives in terms of making impact. Impact requires readership; if only trained economists can understand an article, many non-technical readers of JBV are likely to ignore it. Publishing a technical article in JBV will then neither help the author reach a new audience, nor speak to the audience of economists who may not read JBV – nor enable JBV to maintain its reputation as a top-tier, high-impact journal. Neither the author’s nor the journal’s interests are served by this.

Authors can use several strategies to make their work more accessible to a broad readership. These can be summarized in what I call the ‘3Rs’: ‘Remove’, ‘Reduce’ and ‘Relate’. The first strategy of Remove involves omitting mathematics altogether and providing instead an entirely verbal exposition of the arguments and theoretical predictions, in jargon-free language. This strategy tends to be adopted most by empirical papers with hypothesis-generating sections (though theory papers can do this too: see e.g. Parker, 2016). Numerous articles published in JBV and other entrepreneurship journals take this approach. Economics examples include Parker & van Praag (2012), Gumus & Regan (2015) and Welter & Kim (2018); finance examples include Gonzalez-Diaz & Solis-Rodriguez (2012), Li and Zahra (2012), Buchner et al. (2017) and Wang (2020).<sup>4</sup> The challenge in all cases is to do justice to the underlying theory without diluting the logic or message, or creating an overly

---

<sup>3</sup> A notable exception is Belleflamme et al. (2014), which was one of the first published papers on the exploding topic of crowdfunding.

<sup>4</sup> A variant of this approach states a regression specification and then frames conceptual hypotheses as testable parameter restrictions on the regression model: see Bengtsson & Hand (2011) and Gumus & Regan (2015) for examples.

‘thin’ and superficial theoretical treatment. It takes real skill to draw out the intuition of a formal math model and express it in a form which is accessible while also remaining rich, meaningful and nuanced.

Some economists may resist the injunction to convert the exposition from mathematical to verbal, especially when the mathematics is seen as indispensable for deriving counter-intuitive results. While having some sympathy for this view, it should nevertheless be remembered that even counter-intuitive results in economics are always grounded on logic; the challenge is to explain it clearly in a non-technical manner. Sometimes, the elegance of a technical derivation is unusually compelling, and generates a kind of value in its own right. In these instances, it might be preferable for authors to appeal to connoisseurs in a suitable economics journal than in an entrepreneurship journal like *JBV*.

The second strategy is Reduce. Here, the author retains the key ingredients of a technical model in the body of the paper, but simplifies and reduces it, relegating all the non-essential arguments, lemmas and proofs to an appendix. Authors possess considerable latitude in terms of how much reduction to do. One approach may retain only the main technical ingredients and predictions in the text, moving the full theoretical model to an appendix which the interested reader can pursue to gain deeper insight and which the non-technical reader can simply choose to skip. Appendices can be used to collect details of technical models or econometric estimators, and authors are encouraged to use them extensively if it helps them reduce the weight of technical content remaining in the text. A more minimalist approach is to use appendices simply to house proofs for propositions stated in the text, while retaining the bulk of technical models in the text (for examples, see Fairchild, 2011; Arcot, 2014; Belleflamme et al., 2014; and Hong, 2020).

Another reduction approach is to state one basic equation in the text, before discussing and interpreting it extensively in the following text. See Bengtsson & Hand (2011), Coad et al. (2013) and Parker (2013) for examples. Naturally, this approach tends to work better in mixed theoretical and empirical, rather than purely theoretical, articles. How far ‘reduction’ should go is up to the author, who may be guided by the wisdom encapsulated in the following quotation (attributed to Albert Einstein): “Everything should be made as simple as possible, but no simpler”.

The third strategy, *Relate*, involves making any mathematics in the text more ‘relatable’ to the non-technical reader. The author can do this in various ways, but the basic idea is to provide the reader with ‘a lot of English between the Greek’. For example, authors may furnish a verbal version of theoretical models and predictions before the technical material starts, with a verbal summary afterwards, providing clear and intuitive explanations of what the mathematics is doing before and after an equation is presented (see e.g. Kuechle, 2011; Coad et al., 2013; Parker, 2013; Welter & Kim, 2018; Cippolone & Giordani, 2019). Another useful tip is to supplement a math model with diagrams (e.g. Fairchild, 2011; Norbäck et al., 2016; Welter & Kim, 2018) and numerical examples (e.g. Fairchild, 2011) that can help the non-technical reader grasp the basic ideas being represented by the mathematics. A summary table of symbols also helps less technical readers comprehend technical content (e.g. Minniti & Levesque, 2010; Belleflamme et al., 2014; Welter & Kim, 2018). These examples do not exhaust the set of possibilities under this heading.

So far, the discussion has been mainly directed towards theoretical contributions. But similar arguments apply to empirical methods which are technical in nature. To enhance accessibility and avoid discouraging non-technical readers, extended technical explanations of

econometric methods and specifications should probably be avoided. It is usually possible to: explain the gist of econometric methods in simple and straightforward language; excise details about well-known estimators; and relegate details of more novel estimators to an appendix.

#### *4.3 It should significantly 'move the dial'*

It is worth remembering an earlier observation: *Incremental contributions do not meet JBV's bar in terms of originality and do not appeal to the journal's core readership.* Contributions must significantly move the dial in terms of advancing theoretical and empirical knowledge in the entrepreneurship field. Examples of submissions that do not do this include, among others: minor extensions of existing theories; tests of existing theories or models using new data; the application of new econometric methods to existing data or research questions; and simple literature reviews that do not offer an agenda for future research. Such submissions are likely to be 'desk rejected'. So too are technical theoretical papers which make a relatively minor albeit novel point. Many of these have been submitted (unsuccessfully) to JBV in recent years – especially papers on crowdfunding. A contribution must be weighty and novel, and significantly advance the conversation for it to support the weight of a heavy technical model.

#### *4.4 It should conform to the expectations of the journal readership*

Sections 2 and 3 of this Editorial revealed how economics journals and entrepreneurship journals like JBV adopt somewhat different conventions with respect to format and structure. Economists are sometimes surprised at the apparently 'prescriptive' approach that JBV takes to the structure of articles it publishes. In fact, every reviewer brings their own expectations about the 'proper' format of articles they are asked to review, economists included; what

follows is a brief outline of what many JBV reviewers expect. Economists who have not published in JBV before would do well to consider these points when they submit their paper, to maximize a favorable response from JBV reviewers.

First, the Abstract should clearly state the research question, purpose and contribution of the paper. The Introduction should amplify this, along the lines laid out in section 3 above. The contribution should be clear in relation to prior literature; the research question clearly stated; and the novelty of the paper crisply conveyed up front. An Executive Summary must accompany submissions: it should provide a verbal account of the paper, without citations, which is accessible to practitioners or lay readers (i.e. non-academics). It is a higher-level overview than the Introduction.

Second, the conceptual part of the paper is presented. This draws on prior literature without necessarily including a dedicated literature review. This is usually followed by the data, variables and methods and then the results. Results should be clearly explained and interpreted and tied back transparently to any hypotheses that underpin them. It is helpful to always bear in mind the following questions: ‘what do the results mean for our understanding of entrepreneurship? How are they different from previous results? What explains them?’ A focus on economic significance as well as statistical significance is encouraged. Something that economists tend to be accomplished at doing is running empirical robustness checks: these are strongly encouraged but should not distract from the main message of the paper.

Finally, the Discussion section in JBV tends to be much more extensive than in many economics journals. Section 3 presented some guidance as to structure; regarding content, it is necessary to go beyond superficial statements about policy implications, etc. Authors are expected to push themselves to draw out reasonable, interesting and well-justified

implications of their results. This can be challenging for economists who have not been required to do this before by economics journal reviewers and editors.

## **5. Conclusion**

Impactful and novel economics papers are welcome at JBV. To increase the chances these papers get published, this editorial has provided some guidance to authors which, it is hoped, will encourage them to tailor their work to meet the journal's expectations. Of course, tailoring economics content to fit the expectations of a non-economics journal can be challenging, especially for theoretical articles. Some 'fixes' are relatively simple to do, for example minimizing the use of jargon; but others are much harder, including making technical content more accessible to non-technical readers. This editorial has offered some constructive suggestions, most notably those encapsulated in the '3Rs'. Reviewing the last decade of published papers in JBV shows that although it can be challenging, it is eminently feasible for economists to communicate effectively with entrepreneurship scholars and contribute to entrepreneurship scholarship. This journal eagerly anticipates the opportunity to publish more of these contributions in the coming decades.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to thank Thomas Åstebro, Jeffery McMullen, Peter Thompson and Karl Wennberg for helpful comments on an earlier draft. The usual disclaimer applies.

## References

- Anderson, B. S., Wennberg, K., & McMullen, J. S. (2019). Enhancing quantitative theory-testing entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(5), 105928.
- Arcot, S. (2014). Participating convertible preferred stock in venture capital exits. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 72-87.
- Ardito, C., Leombruni, R., Mosca, M., Giraud, M., & d'Errico, A. (2017). Scar on my heart: effects of unemployment experiences on coronary heart disease. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(1), 62-92.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T., & Schwienbacher, A. (2014). Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(5), 585-609.
- Bengtsson, O., & Hand, J. R. (2011). CEO compensation in venture-backed firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(4), 391-411.
- Buchner, A., Mohamed, A., & Schwienbacher, A. (2017). Diversification, risk, and returns in venture capital. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(5), 519-535.
- Cipollone, A., & Giordani, P. E. (2019). Entrepreneurs meet financiers: Evidence from the business angel market. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(5), 105913.
- Coad, A., Frankish, J., Roberts, R. G., & Storey, D. J. (2013). Growth paths and survival chances: An application of Gambler's Ruin theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(5), 615-632.
- Fairchild, R. (2011). An entrepreneur's choice of venture capitalist or angel-financing: A behavioral game-theoretic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(3), 359-374.

- Gonzalez-Diaz, M., & Solis-Rodriguez, V. (2012). Why do entrepreneurs use franchising as a financial tool? An agency explanation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(3), 325-341.
- Gumus, G., & Regan, T. L. (2015). Self-employment and the role of health insurance in the US. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(3), 357-374.
- Hong, J. (2020). The financing of alliance entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(1).
- Kuechle, G. (2011). Persistence and heterogeneity in entrepreneurship: An evolutionary game theoretic analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(4), 458-471.
- Lee, Y. S. (2018). Government guaranteed small business loans and regional growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(1), 70-83.
- Li, Y., & Zahra, S. A. (2012). Formal institutions, culture, and venture capital activity: A cross-country analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(1), 95-111.
- McMullen, J. S. (2019). A wakeup call for the field of entrepreneurship and its evaluators. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(3), 413-417.
- Minniti, M., & Lévesque, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial types and economic growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(3), 305-314.
- Nikolova, M. (2019). Switching to self-employment can be good for your health. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(4), 664-691.
- Norbäck, P. J., Persson, L., & Svensson, R. (2016). Creative destruction and productive preemptive acquisitions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(3), 326-343.

- Parker, S. C. (2013). Do serial entrepreneurs run successively better-performing businesses?.  
*Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(5), 652-666.
- Parker, S. C. (2016). Family firms and the “willing successor” problem. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(6), 1241-1259.
- Parker, S. C., & Van Praag, C. M. (2012). The entrepreneur's mode of entry: Business takeover or new venture start? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(1), 31-46.
- Wang, P. (2020). Broadening versus reinforcing investor portfolios: Social structure and the search for venture capital investors. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(1).
- Welter, C., & Kim, S. (2018). Effectuation under risk and uncertainty: A simulation model. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(1), 100-116.