



UNIVERSITAS  
MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA

DEPARTMENT OF  
CIVIL ENGINEERING

Prof. Agus Setyo Muntohar, Ph.D.(Eng.)

# **PREPARING A RESPONSE TO EDITOR(S) & REVIEWER(S) COMMENTS**

# Editor Comment

- After submission, Editor will inform Author(s) regarding the Manuscript Number.
- Editor will look into the Abstract, Keyword, and Novelty of the submitted paper to decide whether suitable for the scope or not.
- Editor will comment if the paper is out of the scope and suggest to submit for suitable journal.



# Editor Comment

- Editor will assign two or three reviewers who are reputable in his/her area (peer-reviewer).
- Review, commonly, should be completed within 30 days or 4 weeks.
- Do not surprise!!! Once the decision is mailed by Editor:
  - Major revision
  - Minor revision
  - Accept as received
  - Reject



# Editor decision

- Example of Editor decision:
  - *“Your Technical Paper, listed above, has completed a review for publication in ASCE's Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering. The editor has requested that a revised manuscript be prepared based on the reviewers' evaluations (shown at the end of this email) and submitted for re-review by 05/05/2012.”*



# Reviewers' comment

- Do not give up!!! A tough comment is common. It is good for our future research.
- Read the Reviewers' comment carefully.
- Start to write Author's Reply to address Reviewer comment.
- Try to answer all question and clearly write.
- A good reviewer will always criticize the results as well as method and conclusions.



# Reviewers' comment

- Example of Reviewers' comment:
  - The authors have made significant effort to revise the manuscript. However, the manuscript is not satisfactory. Three issues are concerned:
    - 1) the language: I can easily find many mistakes in grammar/wording;
    - 2) the data/result reliability and accuracy:
      - the authors did not provide convincing explanations and reasoning for some comments from the reviewers.
      - For example, the 3rd comment from Reviewer #2; the 7th, 10th, and 11th comments from Reviewer #3.
      - Also, I would think that adding too much plastic fiber can cause negative effect on friction.
    - 3) the originality of the work: some extensive testing was conducted for the soil, but no in-depth mechanisms or understanding could be gained.



# Start Your Author's Response

- Authors should respond to each numbered reviewer comment in the word document provided.
- Ensure that your responses are distinguished from the comments by placing them below each comment and using a different **font colour**.
- Keep in mind that each reviewer read your manuscript independently. Therefore, reviewers may share the same concerns or may have conflicting concerns.



- If reviewers have similar concerns, you need only provide a response to the first instance the concern is raised (e.g. if the same concern is raised by reviewers 1 and 2, you can respond to reviewer 1 and in your responses to reviewer 2 you can specify *“see response number X to reviewer 1 above.”*)
- If reviewers share similar concern please take them especially seriously.





- If reviewers have conflicting concerns, you may agree with one reviewer's suggestion and not the other, and you may specify this in your responses e.g. in response to reviewer 2 you can specify

*“alternatively, in line with reviewer 1 comment number X I made changes XYZ.”*



- Keep in mind that you are encouraged to consider each reviewer comment but you are not expected to necessarily agree with the reviewer's suggestion—if you disagree with their suggestion and choose not to implement the change please simply explain why in your responses e.g.

*“I appreciate the reviewer's suggestion, however I do not feel this revision is necessary because XYZ.”*



- Your responses do not have to be lengthy. Responses can simply point to the section of your manuscript where you addressed their concern e.g. *“See revisions on page 2 paragraph 2.”*



- If reviewers raise a broad concern e.g. *“This paper requires editing for clarity”*
- Your response can simply affirm that you revised your paper accordingly e.g. *“I did a thorough edit of my paper to clarify my language and arguments.”*



# Closing Remark

- Remember that your responses to the reviewer feedback will be sent back to the reviewers for their consideration in the second review.





UNIVERSITAS  
MUHAMMADIYAH YOGYAKARTA

DEPARTMENT OF  
CIVIL ENGINEERING

Prof. Agus Setyo Muntohar, Ph.D.(Eng.)

# **EXAMPLES OF THE AUTHOR'S RESPONSE**