

## 第十六讲 稿件退返修及相关事项

论文发表并非一蹴而就。投稿之后直接得到期刊编辑与审稿人认同,不需要修改而录用的情况几乎没有。很多稿件甚至都没有进入送审环节,就遭到了编辑的直接拒稿(Desk Rejection)。当然还有些稿件,虽然通过初审、二审,甚至是到了三审环节,最终还是被拒稿,际遇“凄惨”。

被拒稿的原因很多,本讲介绍了一些常见拒稿类型及被拒稿的原因。希望能够帮助初学者在论文写作与投稿过程中,尽可能避免一些不应该犯的“低级”错误,让论文顺利进入审稿环节,争取更大几率被发表。

同时,本讲还从返修程序与修后回复出发,针对不同程度的修改通知做以简单介绍,提出一些需要掌握的回复技巧和注意事项。最后,介绍了规范化回复审稿意见的一些基本方法。

### 第一节 拒稿及原因分析

#### 一、拒稿类型

1. 直接拒稿(Desk Rejection),是指论文投稿尚未进入同行专家评审(送审)环节,编辑先对论文内容和质量进行了初步评估,判断后直接做出的拒稿决定。一般而言,这种决定是一次性的,作者不再具有继续投稿而被接收的可能。通常,编辑可能会给投稿人发送如下内容的邮件:

例 1:

*Thank you for considering The Journal as a venue for your manuscript!*

*Publishing in The Journal is becoming increasingly competitive as there is limited space in the journal. With this in view, we have to prioritize papers with outstanding novelty and broad impact, and some good quality articles sometimes cannot be accommodated. We are unable to consider the paper for publication at this time because of the following:*

*—The manuscript appears to address an important issue. However, the subject is not well aligned with the aims and scope of The Journal. Your paper would be better served in a journal appropriate for this content such as a journal related to Journal A or Journal B.*

*—In fact, we have limited editorial expertise in this area and I cannot identify a suitable editor to knowledgeably handle this paper.*

*—This decision has nothing to do with the novelty or quality of the described work.*

*—Please see our refined Aims & Scope for the types of research that we would like to publish.*

*In spite of the unfavorable outcome for this paper, we trust that you will continue to submit other manuscripts for publication in The Journal.*

例 2:

*—Thank you for submitting this paper to “The Journal”. The topic is important, but unfortunately, the scholarship does not meet the standards we require in order to send it out for a full peer review. Therefore, I must reject the paper at this initial stage of review. The peer review process places high demands upon experts in the field, and the very large number of submissions to The Journal requires us to be highly selective in imposing upon reviewers who give freely of their time. For your information, because of our very large number of submissions, we must be highly selective—rejecting more than 80% of submissions.*

*—This decision is final and there is no option to re-submit this paper in revised form.*

*—We appreciate your initial interest in The Journal and for giving us the opportunity to consider your work. I am sorry for not having better news for you. The Authors Guide found at our journal website tells more about the scholarly approach and scope suitable for the journal.*

*—We appreciate you submitting your manuscript to The Journal and thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work.*

2. 编辑采纳评审人的拒稿意见,与上述类型不同,这种情况意味着作者提交的论文已经历了完整的一轮同行评审专家评阅过程,但审稿人认为论文没有达到期刊发表要求,建议编辑进行拒稿。多数情况下,编辑会充分尊重审稿人意见而给予拒稿决定。也有特殊情况,编辑评估后认为论文经过修改后可以达到期刊要求。所以,有时并不完全采纳审稿人意见而拒稿,而是给出了修改后重投的决定(Encourage Resubmission after Revisions)。当然,也有多个审稿人的推荐意见不统一,存在一定或较大分歧时,编辑会邀请更多的审稿人再审,之后再做出最终决定。在回复中,编辑可能发送如下内容的邮件:

例 3:

*We appreciate you submitting your manuscript to The Journal and thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work. However, I have to regret to inform you that the reviewers recommend against publishing your manuscript, and I must therefore reject it. The comments of the reviewers are below.*

例 4:

*I am writing to you concerning the manuscript you recently submitted to The Journal. Based on the review reports, the manuscript is not suitable for publication in The Journal in its present format. Significant revisions or new data are required in the manuscript to warrant further consideration for publication of this manuscript in The Journal.*

## 二、常见拒稿原因

拒稿是所有作者都不乐意看到的结果。归纳起来,拒稿原因无非就是接受稿件不符合期刊要求。是什么原因,导致不符合要求而被拒稿呢?编辑 Richard Daft 通过分析 111 篇被拒稿件,找出了导致拒稿的 258 个问题<sup>①</sup>,这里列举一些常见的问题,供读者参考:

- (1)来稿格式不规范,不符合期刊要求;
- (2)论文文字重复率超过期刊要求(例如不超过 10%);
- (3)没有遵照期刊要求进行匿名投稿;
- (4)文稿数据来源交代不明确;
- (5)数据时效性不足;
- (6)数据时长不足以说明问题或支撑结论;
- (7)图表制作不能达到清晰、规范与准确的要求;
- (8)参考文献的撰写格式不规范;
- (9)参考文献的数量不足以支撑立论;
- (10)参考文献缺乏时效性;
- (11)没有引用主流期刊的参考文献;
- (12)数学建模及其表达不准确不严格;
- (13)行文不流畅,文字表述欠佳,出现多处错别字;
- (14)引言部分没有回答清楚撰写本文的科学依据;
- (15)立论不充分,研究结论空泛或可靠性有待提升;
- (16)稿件创新性水平有待提升;
- (17)稿件选题重复;
- (18)同类稿件挤压;
- (19)来稿内容不符合期刊宗旨或是选题;
- (20)来稿不符合期刊的写作范式;
- (21)理论缺失;
- (22)概念与操作化(operationalization)不一致;
- (23)(理论)定义不充分;
- (24)(设计、方法)理论基础不充分;
- (25)文章结构不连贯;
- (26)格式与用词不专业;
- (27)研究设计不足;
- (28)与专业不相关;
- (29)过分强调方法论;
- (30)结论不一致;
- (31)剪裁修改前人数据等。

---

<sup>①</sup> Richard L. Daft. , 1995. Why I recommended your manuscript be rejected and what you (can do) about it. Organizational Sciences. London: Sage. 167

可见,导致拒稿的原因是多种多样的。除了违反学术道德以外,常见拒稿原因大致可归纳为三类:

1. 不严谨而导致直接拒稿。期刊编辑与审稿人格外注重研究的科学性,亦是严谨性。即便有重大研究发现的论文,但是论文中存在大量“低级”错误,甚至无视期刊细节要求,都会被认为是科学研究的不严谨、工作态度的不端正,因而论文质量也会遭受到严重质疑,进而面临被拒稿的可能。

一般来说,初学者因不严谨而可能犯的错误包括,篇幅超出期刊限制(参考文献数量、正文篇幅);文本及图表格式不规范、不统一;材料提供不齐全,缺少重要数据;粗心大意而造成图表、公式、章节的序号位置的混乱;图片清晰度差且不美观等等。以上这些情况的出现,都是不严谨的具体表现,是影响论文顺利进入审稿及后续环节的重要因素。而事实上,如果投稿人足够细心,这些都是可以完全避免的。

2. 论文内容以外的原因,通常包括研究主题是否符合期刊目标范围、期刊决策策略、审稿人及编辑个人因素等。

论文主题不符合期刊目标范围,是比较常见的一个拒稿原因。虽然目标期刊在作者指南中关注了某些领域,但是不排除与目标期刊近期主题不符的可能。

期刊投稿策略,包括目标期刊的年发稿量、接收率,以及对相似研究和发表量限制等。比如 Nature 每年收到的投稿量过万篇,而投稿量越大,也就意味着其拒稿量也越大。在发表数量限制下,期刊编辑总会偏好一些创新性高、研究成果意义巨大的文章;或是尽可能接收能覆盖其期刊所关注各类主题范围的文章,从而通过精心挑选,剔除一些主题重复的稿件。当然,其中不乏也有高质量的。不同的期刊由于关注领域不同、期刊分区差异等,在决策上也存在较大差异。

编辑及审稿人个人因素差异可能造成不同类型稿件处理方式,包括拒稿。例如,由于专业经验、学术背景以及研究方向,甚至是个人喜好、观念等因素,不同的审稿人尤其是编辑,对同一篇论文的看法观点可能不同而造成不一样的投稿结果。比如,一篇手稿收到了一份大修、一份小修,以及一份拒稿的审稿意见,对于某个编辑而言,可能选择大修的决定;但是换成另一个编辑时,可能就直接予以了拒稿。

3. 论文内容质量没有达到期刊出版要求,这是作者最应关注的一类拒稿原因,主要包括:创新性与重要性不足、研究设计存在缺陷、写作不规范、对科学问题提炼不到位等。

创新性与重要性不足,主要由论文选题及内容本身所造成。类似的说法还有,结果没有理论或实际意义、采用的方法很常见、研究结果与结论已为人们熟知等。深受期刊编辑喜爱的论文往往是那些具有开创性的研究,尤其是顶级刊物,尤为关注创新性与重要性。如果通过修改,使得论文创新性与重要性得以提升,通常也是最难修改的一类情况。对于一些泛泛而谈,只讲研究创新性高,研究结果意义重大,但指出的创新和重大意义,往往得不到编辑和审稿人的认可与赞同,多数会面临质疑,乃至拒稿。

研究设计不足,包括未立足于广阔的背景、研究对象选择不恰当、方法设计不能解决所提出的科学问题、采用的方法不具有可复制性不可靠甚至无效、生搬硬套方法或模型、统计分析错误、数据来源不明或缺失、研究样本数量不足或选择不合理、数据结果不足以支撑结论、讨论重复研究结果或不具有广度和深度等等。有些问题是论文选题自身局限性所致;有些是实验设计不合理所致;还有些与论文写作不规范有关,不逐一而论。

对论文探讨的科学问题提炼不到位,虽然与论文的创新性不足有关,但背后实际原因还是

作者对科学问题的认识不全面,造成片面或偏颇的论述。这种情况在采用“流水线”式的文献综述中最为常见,也是初学者比较难以掌握的一个写作环节。

## 第二节 返修程序与修改回复

### 一、收到修改通知

修改通知最常见的包括大修(Major Revisions)和小修(Minor Revisions)两种。

两者都是编辑基于审稿意见和全面评估论文内容质量等基础上之后做出的决定。无论哪一种,作者都要按照审稿意见要求,认真修改后,重新提交,以接受编辑以及审稿人的重新评审和评估。

相较而言,两者的区别在于,大修稿件,编辑和审稿人认为存在较多或较严重问题,作者需要花费很多气力,进行较大范围或程度上的修改。哪怕就是某一点的修改要求,都会造成论文很大的修改量及较大的难度。比如更新数据,重新计算,如今年是2023年,作者写了一篇论文研究“近期”某一个问题的现象,而文中的“近期”作者选用的是2010年,这时,审稿人以及编辑可能会建议作者更换“2010年”数据,采用2020年甚至2022年数据,从而对论文进行全面订正。

对于小修稿件来说,论文中可能仅存在一些细枝末节的修改,如某句话的表意不明、某些图表还需要美化、还需要增添某些参考文献等等。

一般来说,对于大修的稿件,编辑会给较长的修改时间,比如一个月;而对于小修的稿件,可能仅仅一周不等。

### 二、明确修改要求

稿件的修改要求也主要有两种:编辑直接告知和期刊投稿指南。

通常,编辑在收到审稿人评审意见后,会汇总这些意见,做出修改通知,并且通过邮件的方式告知修改决定。如例5:

*Your manuscript has been reviewed by experts in the field. Please find your manuscript with the referee reports at this link: .....*

(1) *Please revise your manuscript according to the referees' comments and upload the revised file within 28 September 2021.*

(2) *Please use the version of your manuscript found at the above link for your revisions.*

(3) *Any revisions made to the manuscript should be marked up using the "Track Changes" function if you are using MS Word/LaTeX, such that changes can be easily viewed by the editors and reviewers.*

(4) *Please provide a short cover letter detailing your changes for the editors' and referees' approval.*

*If one of the referees has suggested that your manuscript should undergo extensive English revisions, please address this issue during revision. We propose that you use one of the editing services listed at (.....) or have your manuscript*

*checked by a native English-speaking colleague.*

*Besides, we have sent your manuscript to the academic editor for first decision in the same time, please note that there may have additional comments.*

*Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions regarding the revision of your manuscript or if you need more time. We look forward to hearing from you soon.*

此外有些期刊投稿指南中,也会注明关于提交修改稿的要求,如例6:

#### REVISED SUBMISSIONS

*—When submitting the revised manuscript, please make sure that you upload the final version of the paper. Please remove the old version(s) of the manuscript before submitting the revised version.*

*—Use of word processing software.*

*—Regardless of the file format of the original submission, at revision you must provide us with an editable file of the entire article. Keep the layout of the text as simple as possible. Most formatting codes will be removed and replaced on processing the article. The electronic text should be prepared in a way very similar to that of conventional manuscripts (see also the Guide to Publishing with Elsevier). See also the section on Electronic artwork.*

*—To avoid unnecessary errors you are strongly advised to use the ‘spell-check’ and ‘grammar-check’ functions of your word processor.*

总的来说,修改要求是具体的、有明确限制性内容的,比如修改截止日期、重新在系统提交或采用原有稿件编码、提供可编辑的文档文件、采用修订模式或标记出所有的修改之处、语言校编、撰写针对审稿人意见逐一回复并详细说明如何修改的回复信等。

### 三、注意回复事项

回复审稿意见是一项非常细致入微的工作。即便给出稿件的是小修意见,也不乏有很多“大意失荆州”的情况发生。当然,对于需要大修稿件,经过全面修改,并获得审稿意见的肯定回复之后,有时会从“大修”进入“小修”状态;有时还可能会直接进入“接收(accept at the current form)”的决定,进入校稿环节。因此,认真回复审稿意见,是论文是否能够得到编辑和审稿人认同,被接收发表的尤为关键的一步。以下介绍一些需要注意的事项:

1. 时刻保持谦逊的态度<sup>①</sup>。与审稿人发生争执是非常不明智、不理智的。无论审稿专家给出了什么样的负面评价,或是语言上的不恰当表述,都要心平气和。首先,审稿专家是非常专业的,从事过大量科研劳动,具备较高的专业素质和科研能力。其次,很多期刊采用的是双盲审,审稿专家与论文作者不存在利益冲突甚至潜在利益冲突,不存在刻意为难投稿人的情况。或许,有很多作者自认为审稿人没有看懂其研究,实则因学科领域不同,审稿人就自身的专业视角,已提出了真知灼见。此外,有些质疑本身就是作者的表述不清造成

<sup>①</sup> 医盟V课堂(知乎). 2020-11-26. 6招方法稳准狠有策略的返修论文! <https://zhuanlan.zhihu.com/p/88435337>.

的。因此,即便十分不认可审稿人的观点,或其情绪化的语言,也无须在回复中表现出来,在言语上进行回击和质疑。作者应避免使用“*We totally disagree...*”、“*The reviewer obviously does not know this field*”等话语,建议采用“*We agree..., but...*”等合理的表达方式。这不仅要体现出作者对编辑及审稿人的充分尊重,同时还要向其辛劳表以感谢。以上是科研人员的基本素养。

2. 逐条回复审稿意见。回复信,在形式上,对于多位审稿人的意见要清晰地、点对点地逐条回复,并标注出修改地方,这是回复审稿意见的基本原则。为了避免遗漏、保证全部意见都能够得到答复,不要将多位审稿人的意见归纳整合成一条回复。如果审稿人的意见是连续的段落,可将每个段落或单个段落,分成若干条目之后,进行逐一回应。如果不确定某项意见的意思、观点,可以先解释自己对该意见的理解,然后再进行回复。有效的回复要确保每一条意见对应一条回复。切忌抱有侥幸心理,否则有避重就轻之嫌。

3. 合理把握争辩的分寸。当不同意审稿人的意见时,辩解是在所难免的,但是要把握好分寸。对数据、方法的争辩,需建立在按照审稿人意见分析后、列出相应结果的基础上,通过相应的参考文献进行佐证。对于观点类争辩,可以通过足够的、权威的参考文献作为支持,有条理地分点阐述,并按照正文格式列出参考文献。当审稿意见直击要害,难以改进,这时一定要敢于承认文章的缺陷,可以解释修改的困难所在,并详细阐述自己为此做出的努力,并指出已在论文中进行了深刻讨论。任何一篇文章都不是完美的,这点审稿人也十分理解,千万不要因为不敢承认缺陷而坚持己见,最终遭遇拒稿。此外,不要与审稿人在每一个问题上都争辩。一些无关紧要的细节,如果审稿人说的也有道理,做出妥协,也不无不可。

4. 所有 comments 都要给出积极正面的反馈。如果审稿人对文章数据或者分析方法存有异议时,那么意味着整篇论文各部分,包括方法设计、结果分析、图表制作、讨论部分都可能需要修改。此时,对于作者来讲,难免心生抗拒,依然抱有不改也行能够侥幸“过关”的心里。也许,按照审稿人意见对原文进行修改,对论文的质量提升有很大帮助。但是,也许这种修改对文章质量提升帮助不大。不过,想通过争辩来解决问题的处理方法,是不建议的。较好的处理方式是,所有的修改建议都应该得到有效回复。认同审稿人的意见并按之修改的,最好。如果不认同,也不能偷懒,即使正文中不予修改,但是在回复信中,也必须将未采纳该意见的相关解释,尤其是引用了可以作证自己观点的文献一一附上,作为完整的科学讨论。

5. 注明修改之处与新增资料。回复信中,最好把审稿人意见与回复内容采用不同字体或颜色进行区分。提交的返修稿保存格式中,也最好提供采用“修订”模式的文档,或者对修改内容进行突出标记。一般而言,多数期刊对此都有严格的要求,否则被退回,要求重新提交。在稿件有连续行号的情况下,要做到逐点回复,标明从哪一行到哪一行是修改的内容。当修改过程中加入了新的数据、表格、图片等内容时,一定要指出添加在哪一部分,标明具体的行号。必要时,还可以作为补充资料提交,或直接附在回复信之后,并在信中明确交代。

6. 把握好提交截止时间。无论是大修稿件,还是小修稿件,编辑都会给出明确的修改提交截止时间。如果不能在截止时间之前完成修改,应及时与编辑联系,延长修改时间,推迟截止日期。不建议特别是处理大修稿件时,修改所用的时间极短,甚至是在接收到返修邮件的第二天或第三天就修改结束,完成了重新提交。这样会让编辑和审稿人觉得作者敷衍了事。总体上,一定要让编辑和审稿人认为,作者郑重审慎地对待了每一位审稿人及编辑给出的每一条修改意见。

#### 四、规范回复信写作

回复审稿意见、给出修改反馈,通常是通过撰写一封回复信实现的。回复信多是逐条回复的规范化信件。首先,其中应有对论文主要修改内容的总结,反映论文质量取得明显改善;其次,对所有审稿人意见逐条回复的内容,体现出所有意见都被认真对待、并按之对论文做以相应修改;此外,回信中还应该包括正式的格式,提供基本信息,如论文题目、稿件编号、修改时间、作者、单位及联系方式等。可以说,优质的回复信,也是优质论文的一个重要组成部分。那么如何撰写回复信呢?下面提供一些模板,供初学者参考学习:

例 7:

*Dear Editor and reviewers:* (回复编辑及审稿人)

*Thanks for taking your time to review our manuscript titled “××××××” (ID: ××××××). We really appreciate all your comments and suggestions! Please find our itemized responses in below and the revised version as the resubmitted file.*

*Thanks again!*

(回复审稿人意见)

*SUGGESTIONS FROM EDITOR:* (将编辑的建议复制到此处,不要只有回复)

*RESPONSE TO THE EDITOR:* (对编辑意见的回复。如果编辑的意见较多,也应拆分逐点回复。)

*COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS:*

*Reviewer #1:* (逐点回复,意见与回复内容进行格式区分,如字体格式)

*Comment 1:*

*Response 1:*

*Comment 2:*

*Response 2:……*

—————*End of Reply to Reviewer #1*—————

*Reviewer #2:* (逐点回复,意见与回复内容进行格式区分,如字体格式)

*Comment 1:*

*Response 1:*

*Comment 2:*

*Response 2:*

—————*End of Reply to Reviewer #2*—————

例 8:

*Dear Editor and reviewers:* (回复编辑及审稿人)

*Thanks for your letter dated February 22. We were happy to know that our work “××××××” (ID: ××××××) was considered as potentially acceptable for publication in The Journal, subject to adequate revision. We really appreciate that the reviewers for the time and effort that have put into our manuscript. Your*



*suggestions have enabled us to improve our work a lot. Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript. Accordingly, we have uploaded a copy of the original manuscript with all the changes highlighted.*

*Appended to this letter is our point-by-point response to the comments raised by the reviewers. The comments are copied and our responses are given directly afterwards in a different colour (red).*

*We would like to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript and hope the revised manuscript is qualified for publication in the The Journal.*

*Sincerely,*

*The correspondence author*

*E-mail:*

SUGGESTIONS FROM EDITOR:(回复审稿意见)

RESPONSE TO THE EDITOR:

COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS:(回复审稿人意见)

*Encl. Responses to comments from Reviewer 1, 2, and 3.*

*Reply to Reviewer #1*

*Dear Reviewer,*

*Thank you very much for your time involved in reviewing the manuscript and your very encouraging comments on the merits. To facilitate this discussion, we reproduce your comments(in italic font) and then present our responses to the comments (in red)point-by-point accordingly.*

*Comment 1: Some writing issues, in terms of grammar: plural and singular of verbs (e. g., “××××”). This manuscript should be proofread.*

*Response 1: Thank you for the detailed review. We have carefully and thoroughly proofread the manuscript to correct all the grammar and typos.*

*Comment 2: The title is too long and should be further focused.*

*Response 2: Thank you for the title suggestion. The precedent version of the title has been replaced. Now, it is ×××, five words shorter than the former title.*

*Comment 3: The paper needs to add ×××.*

*Response 3: Thanks for your great suggestion on improving the accessibility of our manuscript. We have added xxx, Line ××, (Page ××). The relevant contents are provided below as a screen dump for your quick reference.*

*Comment 4: Line 25, page 1...*

*Response 4: Modified throughout the text according to the comment (Line 20,*

page 1).

*Comment 5: Line 33, page 3...*

*Response 5: Thank you for underlining this deficiency. This section was revised and modified according to the information showed in the work suggested by the reviewer (Line 41, page 3).*

*Comment 6:*

*Response 6:*

.....

*We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all your time involved and this great opportunity for us to improve the manuscript. We hope you will find this revised version satisfactory.*

*Sincerely,*

*The Authors*

—————*End of Reply to Reviewer #1*—————

类似的格式和模板可以再分别回应 Reviewer2 and Reviewer3。

相对来说,逐条回复审稿人意见的回复信格式比较单一,内容侧重表明已进行了详尽的修改。相对的,对编辑的回复格式与内容比较灵活。这里再给两则案例:

例 9:

*Month/Date/Year/Administration/Authors*

*Re: Response for manuscript Title of ××× (Number: ×××)*

*Dear Dr. ×××,*

*Thanks for providing us with this great opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript. We appreciate the detailed and constructive comments provided by the reviewers. We have carefully revised the manuscript by incorporating all the suggestions by the review panel.*

*We hope this revised manuscript has addressed your concerns, and look forward to hearing from you.*

*Sincerely,*

*The Authors*

例 10:

*Dear Dr/Prof ××× (Editor-in-chief or Editor who issued the decision letter),*

*Thanks for your letter and your comments. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. We have revised the last version of our manuscript and would like to resubmit it for your consideration. We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewers, and two versions of the revised manuscript (changes tracked and cleaned) for your further assessment. Point-by-point responses to the reviewers' comments are listed clearly in this*

letter.

*The revised manuscript has been edited by ××× language editing service.*

*We do hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal.*

*Thank you again for your consideration.*

*Sincerely*

*Correspondence author*

*Address:*

*E-mail:*

总之,初学者应在明确编辑和期刊指南要求的前提下,综合考虑审稿意见和修改情况,确定回复信的基本内容,就可以写出一封全面准确而又不失礼貌的回复信了。

## 五、提交返修稿

返修稿,即在原始提交论文稿的基础上进行修改的版本,通常情况下要带有修改的“痕迹”,或使用“修订模式”、或对修改内容进行格式凸显(如加粗、高亮、倾斜、下划线、变换颜色等)。有时,或许需要作者重新登录到投稿系统内,将原始提交的稿件重新下载,而不是用自己的版本进行修改。原因可能是编辑已经对所提交的稿件进行了编辑。这一点需要作者仔细阅读编辑发送的修改要求。

此外,还有一些细节需要作者仔细处理。比如在有行号要求的时候,回复信中出现的行号标注,必须正确对应修改稿件中修改内容的位置,一定不要写错了。

当所有材料都准备齐全后,就可以在系统内重新提交了。程序基本与投稿时一致。

## 六、其它事项

1. 延长稿件返修时间。一般来说,修改稿提交时间必须严格遵守编辑给定的截止时间。确实无法按时提交修改稿时,可以写信向编辑表明困难,申请延长修改提交时间。比如以下案例:

*Dear Editor ×××,*

*Thank you very much for your Email of “month/date/year” regarding our manuscript titled ××× (Number xxx). Sincere thanks also go to the responsible and kind reviewers for helping us improve our manuscript. (表达感谢)*

*As soon as receiving your Email, all the authors discussed the comments one by one carefully. We totally agree with the reviewers that major revisions need to make in our manuscript. We also found that it would be difficult to address some issues raised by the reviewers. For example, (端正态度)*

*So, we do not think the revised manuscript will be finished by the deadline of ×××. We estimate it will take a month longer to prepare the revised manuscript and the response to the comments. (体现难处)*

*We would be grateful if you could postpone the deadline on our expected*

deadline. (提出需求)

*Thank you once again and for your consideration.*

*Best Regards.*

*Yours sincerely,*

*Correspondence author:*

*E-mail:*

编辑可能回复:

*Dear (the authors),*

*Thank you for your Email. I have extended the deadline for your revised manuscript submission to **your expected deadline** as requested. If you feel that you will require more time to complete your revision, please let me know and I will update our records accordingly.*

*If I can provide any further advice or assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.*

*Regards,*

×××

2. 对于无法补充实验的说明。如果研究实验确实不够完美(如缺少仪器、部分数据难以获取等),但作者由于客观条件限制无法弥补,而审稿人认为还存在修改的必要。这时需要向编辑如实解释原因,并在讨论部分中正视有关问题,以期得到审稿人和编辑的理解。在回复信中,首先要对审稿人的修改意见表示认同,如 We agree that more study would be useful to understand details of interaction and enhancement。其次,对实际情况进行说明 However, regarding this point we do not have the necessary tool-set/conditions to study... (审稿人要求补充的事项)。最后,指出哪些方法可能解决审稿人提出的问题,如缺乏数据支撑,可以挖掘现有文献的数据,同时表示在接下去的研究中会努力克服这一点,如 We hope, in the future, to explore (the required point). This study is beyond the scope of this report which focuses...。

3. 合理处置与审稿意见分歧较大且无法修改的情况。审稿人常是大领域内的专家,就算是“大同行小外行”提出的审稿意见,多数也从其熟悉的领域提出的善意的意见和建议,很少是故意刁难。遇到这种情况,作者在回复信中可以礼貌性地解释误解,然后提供更加详细的解释,如 We apologize that this part was not clear in the original manuscript, we indeed should give more explanation、We have revised the contexts of this part in Line xxx 等。如果以上做法没有凑效,收到的新一轮审稿意见依然如斯,即审稿人无视了回复信。这时候,建议可以写信给编辑,反映这个问题,希望得到帮助。理论上,编辑会对此事提供处理意见。如果说,作者真的无法按照审稿人意见修改,也只能走完投稿程序,直至收到拒稿通知后,改投它刊。

4. 常见语境表达方式举例。回复信是作者与审稿人、编辑之间的沟通桥梁,其重要性不言而喻。因此,在回复信中保持礼貌、态度谦逊,是投稿人基本素养的体现。在心理上,也会得到审稿人或/和编辑更多的认可与赏识。以下提供一些常见情景的多样化表达方式,供初学者参考。

(1) 概括主要修改内容

—We have responded specifically to each suggestion below. To make the changes easier to identify where necessary, I have numbered them.

—We thank reviewers for their constructive criticism, and time spent to analyze this manuscript, the responses, and explanations related to their comments are listed below.

—We feel great thanks for your professional review work on our article. As you are concerned, several problems need to be addressed. According to your nice suggestions, we have made extensive corrections to our previous draft; the detailed corrections are listed below.

—According to the associate editor and reviewers' comments, we have made extensive modifications to our manuscript and supplemented extra data to make our results convincing. In this revised version, changes to our manuscript were all highlighted within the document by using red colored text.

—We very much appreciate the time and effort you have put into your comments. Your advice about the formatting, structure and referencing style of our paper is most helpful.

—Firstly, we would like to thank you for your kind letter and reviewers' constructive comments concerning our article (Manuscript No.  $\times \times \times$ ). These comments are all valuable and helpful for improving our article. All the authors have seriously discussed all these comments. Accordingly, we have tried best to modify our manuscript to meet with the requirements of your journal. In this revised version, changes to our manuscript within the document were all highlighted by using red colored text. Point-by-point responses to the reviewers are listed below.

—It is excited that we resubmit to you a revised version of our manuscript No.  $xxx$  for The Journal. We appreciate the time and detail provided by each reviewer and by you and have incorporated the suggested changes into the manuscript to the best of our ability. The manuscript has certainly benefited from these insightful revision suggestions. We look forward to this manuscript closer to publication in The Journal.

—On behalf of all the contributing authors, I would like to express our sincere appreciations of your letter and reviewers' constructive comments concerning our article entitled  $\times \times \times$  (Manuscript No.  $\times \times \times$ ). These comments are all valuable and helpful for improving our article. According to the comments, we have made extensive modifications to our manuscript and supplemented extra data to make our results more convincing. In this revised version, changes to our manuscript were all highlighted within the document by using red colored text. Point-by-point responses to the nice associate editor and two nice reviewers are listed below this letter.

—Thank you for your email dated ( $\times \times \times$ ) enclosing the reviewers' com-

*ments. We have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. Our responses are given in a point-by-point manner below. Changes to the manuscript are shown in underline/red/bold.*

*—In conclusion, we give a detailed revision of the original manuscript base on the comments. At the same time, we have thoroughly revised the manuscript to express the idea more clearly. The major revision is listed in the following. We believe the manuscript has been greatly improved. Once again, thank you for the kind advice.*

*—We feel great thanks for your professional review work on our article. As you are concerned, several problems need to be addressed. According to your nice suggestions, we have made extensive corrections to our previous draft. We have added the necessary data to supplement our results and edited our article extensively. The detailed corrections are listed below.*

### (2) 逐点回复审稿人意见

*—Thanks for your comments. We feel really sorry for our carelessness.*

*—We feel sorry that we did not provide enough information about xxx.*

*—Thanks. We have corrected these mistakes based on your suggestions.*

*—As a response to the reviewer's comment, we have...*

*—According to your suggestion, we have corrected  $\times\times\times$  into xxx.*

*—We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We have corrected it into xxx.*

*—It is really a giant mistake to the whole quality of our article. We feel sorry for our carelessness. We have corrected it and we also feel great thanks for your point out.*

*—Your suggestion really means a lot to us. Yes, it would be more understandable if we...*

*—We agree with you. We feel sorry for the improper wording. We have used  $\times\times\times$  as you suggested.*

*—We are very grateful to your comments and thoughtful suggestions. In the revised manuscript, we have modified...*

### (3) 回复信结尾

*—According to the reviewers' comments, we have revised the manuscript extensively. If there are any other modifications we could make, we would like very much to modify them and we really appreciate your help. We hope our manuscript now could be considered for publication in your journal. Thank you very much for your help.*

*—Thank you again for your positive comments on our manuscript. From all the papers published in your journal, readers have been learning a lot. Hopefully, we could have our article been considered of publication in your journal. Should there be any other corrections we could make, please feel free to contact us.*

—Based on these comments and suggestions, we have made careful modifications to the original manuscript, and carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize any possible errors. We believe that the manuscript has been greatly improved and hope it has reached your journal's standard.

—We hope that the changes we have made resolve all your concerns about the article. We are more than happy to make any further changes that will improve the paper and/or facilitate successful publication.

—If there are any other modifications we could make, we would like very much to modify them and we really appreciate your help. Thank you very much for your help.

—Once again, we acknowledge your comments very much, which are valuable in improving the quality of our manuscript.

#### (4) 观点不一致的委婉表达

—We politely/respectfully disagree that...

—We agree with the referee that..., but...

—The referee is right to point out...; yet...

—Following the reviewer's wishes, we have now changed this sentence to...

—It is true that..., but...

—We acknowledge that our paper might have been..., but

—We support the referee's assertion that..., although...

—With all due respect to the reviewer, we felt that this point is not correct...

—We agree with the reviewer's comment concerning this issue. However,

#### (5) 语言问题的回复

—Thanks for your suggestions. We have invited a friend who is a native English speaker to help polish our article. The article was edited extensively. We hope the revised manuscript could be acceptable for you.

—We apologize for the poor language of our manuscript. We have worked on the manuscript for a long time on its readability and also involved native English speakers for language corrections. We really hope that the flow and language level have been substantially improved.

—We have polished this manuscript language by an editing service and wish it satisfies the requirements for publication.

### 第三节 思考与练习

#### 一、课后思考

拒稿是所有科研工作者都不希望看到的结果,但是除了论文质量存在重大问题之外,尽可

能地规避一些不必要的错误,使得论文能够进入审稿环节,其实在多数情况下并非难事。一旦得到了审稿人的评审意见,正确处理好这些修改意见,那么距离发表也不远了。即便是收到了拒稿意见,这些意见对于论文的修改,提升论文质量,也会有很大帮助。

没有人的所有论文投稿都是一帆风顺的。换言之,谁都会面临被拒稿的场景。因此。遭遇拒稿不是可怕的结果,关键在于如何从中吸取好的意见,积极反思,修改手稿,提升质量,争取在新一轮投稿中,得到好的结果。

请初学者们想一想,

1. 论文投稿过程中,有没有寻求导师的帮助?是否就论文质量进行了沟通、创新性进行了提炼?是否获得了导师的修改意见?导师是否在选刊和投稿中给予了建议?最后,这些意见与审稿专家的意见是否具有很多相似之处?如果相似,自己以后应该如何做?如果不同,是否可以请导师帮助分析一下,看看是否能够从中汲取些什么?

2. 每一次投稿经历,都是一次重要实践经验的积累。这次的成功或者是不成功,对于投稿人来说获取和积累了什么经验?对于后续学习和论文写作得到了什么启发?

3. 回想一下,投稿的论文是“单打独斗”完成的?还是团队合作完成的?在团队中,其它成员扮演的角色是什么?彼此交流合作,是否比自己“单打独斗”更加有效率呢?投稿中,团队成员的建议,是否有帮助?

## 二、课后练习

1. 不知道与本课程同步已于上周完成投稿程序的读者,目前稿件处于什么状态。如果遭遇 Desk Rejection 的稿件,通常被拒的最主要的原因是,创新性不足。这时,建议与导师相约深谈一次。重点讨论一下如何提升论文的创新性。当然,在面谈之前,请准备好以下内容:(1)本手稿的创新性是什么?(2)为什么说是创新?(3)创新的立论依据有哪些?(4)这些依据的参考文献是什么?(5)是否已经将相关研究最新成果全部涵盖了?

2. 如果投递稿件还没有信息返回。建议也联系导师约谈一次,重点讨论一下第二篇论文的写作事宜。当然,面谈之前,请同样准备好以上 5 个方面的内容,并且最好制作出 PPT,向导师汇报,基于以上五点,自己要撰写的论文的 working topic 是什么。听取一下导师在这一方面的建议和意见。之后,就准备开始自己第二篇论文的写作之旅吧。

3. 如果初学者或读者们还没有完成投稿程序,请大家务必在完成投稿以后,尝试完成以上两项作业练习。相信这对提升大家论文质量是很有帮助的。

最后,祝大家“旅途顺利”,早日抵达“目的地(论文能够在心仪的目标期刊上得以快速发表)”!