

Revision Procedures

An important point is that a request for either major or minor revision needs to be viewed positively because it indicates that there is a chance that the manuscript can still be accepted and published, provided that all the queries and suggestions by reviewers are satisfactorily addressed.

Upon receiving notice that major revisions of the manuscript will be required, authors may consider submitting it to other journals rather than revising it, as revision can be a very tiring and tricky process. In this context, however, it is recommended for most authors to resubmit their revised manuscript to the same journal, since the journal is likely to have expressed their interest in the authors' study by asking for revisions to be made.

The first general rule is that you take the criticisms of all reviewers seriously. As the author, it's your job to communicate your ideas clearly.

Even in cases where the criticism you received seems unjustified, ask yourself "What can I do better so that this same reviewer will be more likely to buy into my argument next time around?"

Even if you are completely satisfied that your argument holds, ask yourself if you can do a better job of communicating it clearly.

You then need to go through the comments by the editor and all reviewers one by one, and address every single one of them. Broadly speaking, you have three options for how to respond to a particular criticism:

1. When, upon reflection, you agree with the reviewer: You implement a change that does what the reviewer asked for. For example, she may have asked for additional explanation, an additional reference, or the complete rewrite of a section, including a different conclusion.
2. When, despite reflection, you disagree with the reviewer: You might not want to implement some particular suggestions, especially if they relate to subjective matters, which you simply feel differently about.

(For minor suggestions, I suggest just do as the reviewers suggest, because there's nothing to lose; but if you truly disagree, just implementing the suggestions is not a satisfactory solution.)

Still, in this case, you can often communicate more clearly what your position on the issue is. So re-write your text in a way that might convince the reviewer of

your position, lends more weight to your argument, or is simply easier to follow. In this case, you're still making the same argument as before, but you explain it more clearly.

3. When, despite reflection, you think a reviewer is simply wrong: In this case, you change nothing in the text, but you explain in your cover letter to the editor why you did not make the change.

Reference

<https://writingajournalarticle.wordpress.com/the-process-of-publishing>

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles>