

Response to the Editors and Reviewers

Manuscript: [Full manuscript title] | Manuscript ID: [#####]

Journal: [Full journal name]

Dear Editors and Anonymous Reviewers,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript. We are grateful for the time and care the reviewers invested in their feedback. Their comments have meaningfully strengthened the work. Below, we address each point raised and detail the changes made to the manuscript.

To assist navigation, we have organized our responses as follows: *reviewer comments appear in shaded boxes*, followed immediately by our *responses and a brief note on the change made*. All revisions in the manuscript are highlighted in [color / tracked changes].

[Optional: If there were major structural changes — e.g. reorganized sections, expanded methodology, rewritten findings — summarize them here in 2–3 sentences before going into individual responses. This helps editors see the overall arc of revision without reading every comment first.]

Reviewer 1

[If the reviewer opened with a general assessment — e.g. "Overall this is a well-structured study but..." — acknowledge it briefly here before addressing individual comments. If they did not, go straight to Comment 1.]

Comment 1:

[Paste the reviewer's comment here exactly as written. Do not paraphrase — editors compare your response to the original.]

Response: Thank you for this comment.

[Your response. Be specific: explain what you did and why. If you agree, say so and describe the change. If you partially agree, acknowledge the valid concern and explain what you changed and what you retained, with reasoning. Aim for 3–6 sentences per response.]

Change made: [One sentence describing the specific change: e.g. "Revised paragraph 3, page 6, lines 12–15 to clarify the sampling rationale."]

Comment 2:

[Paste the reviewer's comment here exactly as written. Do not paraphrase — editors compare your response to the original.]

Response: Thank you for this comment.

[Your response. Be specific: explain what you did and why. If you agree, say so and describe the change. If you partially agree, acknowledge the valid concern and explain what you changed and what you retained, with reasoning. Aim for 3–6 sentences per response.]

Change made: [One sentence describing the specific change: e.g. "Revised paragraph 3, page 6, lines 12–15 to clarify the sampling rationale."]

[Add further Comment blocks following the same pattern for all remaining Reviewer 1 comments.]

Reviewer 2

[Same structure as Reviewer 1. If Reviewer 2 was generally positive, briefly acknowledge this before addressing their specific suggestions, but keep it short. The substance is in your responses, not in the thanks.]

Comment 1:

[Paste reviewer comment here.]

Response: Thank you for this comment.

[Your response.]

Change made: [Change made.]

[Add further Comment blocks for all remaining Reviewer 2 comments.]

Editor's comments (if applicable)

[If the editor provided their own comments in addition to the reviewer reports, address them here in the same format. Editor comments typically concern scope, structure, or fit with the journal – they often carry more weight than individual reviewer suggestions.]

Editor comment:

[Paste editor comment here.]

Response: Thank you for this comment.

[Your response.]

Change made: [Change made.]

We believe the revised manuscript addresses all concerns raised and has been substantially strengthened as a result. We are grateful for this opportunity and remain happy to provide any further clarification the editors or reviewers may require.

Yours sincerely,

[Author name(s)]

[Position, Institution]

[Email address]

Notes for the author (remove before sending)

- *General response statement: always open with one. It helps editors see the revision at a glance before reading individual comments. summarize the biggest changes (restructuring, new sections, added data) in 2–3 sentences.*
- *Format: paste each reviewer comment exactly as written. Editors cross-check. Paraphrasing can look like you are avoiding a point.*
- *Tone: professional and non-defensive throughout. Even if you disagree, acknowledge what motivated the concern before explaining your position.*
- *When you disagree: cite evidence (prior literature, methodological precedent, your own data). 'We believe' alone is not sufficient, show why your original choice is justified.*
- *Change made note: always include a specific page or line reference if possible. Vague change notes ('we have revised this section') are less useful to editors than precise ones ('revised paragraph 2, p. 8, lines 4–9').*
- *No change: if a suggestion was not adopted, say so explicitly and explain why. Silence on a reviewer's comment is a red flag for editors.*
- *Angry responses: never criticize a reviewer's competence or question their motives. If a comment is genuinely off-base, address the underlying concern calmly and move on.*
- *Length: this letter has no page limit, but responses should be proportionate to the weight of the comment. A minor suggestion warrants 2–3 sentences; a major methodological concern may need a paragraph plus references.*
- *Highlighting: state clearly at the start how revisions are marked in the manuscript (yellow highlight, tracked changes, etc.) and be consistent throughout.*