Editor & Reviewer Comments

How to Deal with the Verdict on Your Returned Manuscript

Peter L. Munk MD, CM, FRCPC, FSIR
Professor of Radiology & Orthopedic Surgery
Director, Musculoskeletal Radiology
Department of Radiology

a place of mind
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Fate of Your Manuscript

- Rejected
  - Outright rejection
  - Rejection with encouragement to resubmit (*very* extensive restructuring)
- Accepted
  - Rare to have acceptance without revision
    - Minor
    - Extensive

Decision Format

- Generally…
- Comments from each reviewer
  - May be edited for clarity and inappropriate comments removed
- Final comment from Editor

Decision Format

- May be brief or detailed
- Dependent on :
  - Journal policy and format
  - How far the manuscript goes down the path of review

Rejection

- *Very common* experience
- Dependent on Journal
  - Higher with competitive and more desirable Journals
  - Electronic and open access Journals often have better acceptance rates
- Can be a *constructive* learning experience
- Can assist in improving a manuscript for submission else where

Rejection

- May occur without review
  - Outside scope of journal / not suitable for readership
  - Similar to previously published / recently accepted material
  - Journal requirements not met

Rejection

- With review
  - Poor methodology and experimental design
  - Flawed interpretation of results / poor statistics
  - Poor writing (grammar, vocabulary etc...)
  - Plagiarism

Rejection

- Fruitless to argue with point blank rejection
- Learn what you can, modify your article if necessary and look to another journal....
- In most cases an improved manuscript will find a place for publication

Accept with Revision

- Remember to stay positive ..... This is a GOOD thing!
- Editor and reviewer comments aimed at improving the manuscript
- Be optimistic ..... there is a very good chance you will get published

Accept with Revision

- Reasons for revision request
  - Minor faults / omissions in methods
  - Minor inaccuracies / contradictions in data
  - Unclear deductions / conclusions
  - Excessive manuscript length
  - Unclear / poor writing that is still felt to be potentially salvageable

Revision

- Address <u>every</u> point made by both reviewers and editor in a covering letter with re-submission of manuscript
- Changes in the text should be clearly indicated
- Do it within the time frame stipulated

Revision

- "the editor and reviewers are always right"
- Well .... sort of.....
- Occasionally (rarely) if some facts or details from editor / reviewer are in error or not justified this can be pointed out
- If this is done remember:
  - Make sure your facts are well supported
  - Be respectful and emotion free
  - The editor will almost always support the reviewer

Revision

- If you cannot agree to make the changes required consider submission to a different journal
- Remember to let the journal know you are withdrawing the article