

Streamlined Response Sheet for Manuscript Revision

Optimiertes Antwortblatt für die Überarbeitung von Manuskripten



Authors

Shigeki Matsubara¹ , Daisuke Matsubara²

Affiliations

- 1 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Jichi Medical University, Shimotsuke, Japan
- 2 Department of Pediatrics, Jichi Medical University, Shimotsuke, Japan

Bibliography

Geburtsh Frauenheilk 2024; 84: 284–285

DOI 10.1055/a-2247-7530

ISSN 0016-5751

© 2024. The Author(s).

This is an open access article published by Thieme under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonDerivative-NonCommercial-License, permitting copying and reproduction so long as the original work is given appropriate credit. Contents may not be used for commercial purposes, or adapted, remixed, transformed or built upon. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Georg Thieme Verlag KG, Rüdigerstraße 14,
70469 Stuttgart, Germany

Correspondence

Prof. Shigeki Matsubara, MD, PhD
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Jichi Medical University
Yakushiji 3311-1
329-0498 Shimotsuke, Japan
matsushi@jichi.ac.jp

Dear Editors,

a response to reviewers' comments is required when submitting a revised manuscript: Many journals simply state that response should be made in a point-by-point manner and indicate all revisions. How to format a response is not stated in the Recommendation of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors [1]. The first author (SM) wrote 531 PubMed-indexed papers and reviewed 2491 manuscripts (Web of Science) [2], and based on our experience we propose a reviewer-friendly response format (► **Table 1**).

First, revisions should be indicated in different font colors in a reviewer-by-reviewer manner: red for Reviewer 1 and blue for Reviewer 2. The reviewer is most interested in whether his/her comments (not the other's) have been incorporated. With different colors, each reviewer can easily check it. Additional revisions are often required after incorporating the comments of the reviewers. Thus, revisions that were not requested by reviewers should be indicated in green. The color code should be stated at the beginning of the response. Red, blue, and green are examples. Colors that are easy to read (not pink or sky blue) should be used.

Second, copy and paste each of the reviewers' comments in the order presented, followed by the response. Reviewers usually do not remember their comments' details and thus glancing at copy-and-paste comments makes them recall the situation they addressed. They can focus on whether the revision is appropriate.

Describing the summary of the reviewer's comments should be avoided. Reviewers are obliged to confirm whether the summary is right.

Third, for each response, refrain from stating gratitude, instead, state "I agree" or "I disagree". The reviewers first wish to know your decision. They next check how their comments are incorporated. Gratitude should be stated once at the beginning of the Response Sheet. Disagreement causes no problem if the author's reasoning is right. There is no need to incorporate all the comments of reviewers.

These response guidelines will make the re-review process easier. The Response Sheet tells all: Reviewers need not check

1. the reviewer's original comments,
2. the author's response,
3. the original text, and
4. the revised manuscript.

A review is usually performed while looking at a small screen of a personal computer or laptop, and not on printed text. Thus, this Response Sheet makes re-review a "streamlined" process. This is reviewer-friendly.

Reviewers are goodwill volunteers but are usually busy clinicians or researchers. This is especially true for doctors of obstetrics and gynecology. They deal with life-threatening emergent conditions. Reviewers wish to thoroughly review a revised manuscript in

► **Table 1** An example of a reviewer-friendly response sheet (to Reviewer 1).

Where?	What should be written?
1. At the beginning of the response:	1. State a short gratitude here only once.* 2. State the meaning of colors.** (Example): The changed parts are indicated in red (Reviewer 1) and blue (Reviewer 2). The newly added parts are indicated in green.
2. For each answer:	1. Copy and paste the reviewer's comments in the order presented. 2. Response: Begin with "I agree" or "I disagree".# (Example): I agree. I revised as indicated below (red font, lines 25–26 of the revised manuscript). 3. Write (copy and paste) lines 25–26 of the revised version in red font (all sentences that were revised should be described here).##
* No need to write a long gratitude. Refrain from stating gratitude for each response. ** A reviewer can focus on whether his/her comments are incorporated. If there are more than one reviewer, "different colors" are much more effective. # State agreement/disagreement first and not gratitude. ## Do not write "See lines 25–26 of the revised manuscript" without describing the revised parts, which would oblige reviewers to read a response and then confirm it in the revised manuscript. Revised parts should be identical to those in the text. This enables the reviewers to determine whether the revisions are appropriate. Thus, this Response Sheet should "streamline" the review process in an expedited manner.	

an expedited manner. Naturally, reviewers' better understanding of your response will increase the possibility of acceptance. At least, this streamlined response sheet will prevent rejection based on the reviewers' misunderstanding of your revision.

We do not consider that the present response format is the best. However, we, after trial and error, grasped this style and employed it for two decades. Thus, this format is time-tested. If the journal has some additional or specific requirements for response, please incorporate them. We hope that this format may be of some help for the authors to revise the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals [Internet]. Accessed January 17, 2024 at: <https://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>
- [2] Web of Science. Review record of Shigeki Matsubara. Accessed January 17, 2024 at: <https://www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/I-5821-2012>