
如何回复SCI投稿同行评审意见

作者：writer 来源：科研动力

本文原地址：<https://www.iikx.com/news/article/845.html>

本文仅供学习交流之用，版权归原作者所有，请勿用于商业用途！

绝大多数SCI投稿杂志都有同行评审，这些评审专家会有一些意见反馈给作者。如何回复同行评审专家评审意见，总的原则是礼貌、委婉、全面。可以采取6步法对评审意见进行回复。本文就此作一简要介绍，并举一些例子进行说明。

在杂志接到稿件以后，会把稿件寄给相关的专家进行评审。对于一些人来说，如何回复这些评审意见比较棘手，一方面是有的评审专家提的意见很尖锐，另一方面可能是部分意见的确不对。但是不管尖锐也好，错误也罢，都要进行认真的回复。

一般原则

回复评审意见有3个基本原则需要注意。

1. 礼貌

无论评审意见正确与否，都要礼貌为先!不要装大爷，认为自己在这个问题上已研究了N年，不会出错。打人不还打脸呢，况且人在屋檐下，怎能不低头。

2. 委婉

有些评审意见可能是错误的，也不要直接说you are wrong，应该委婉一些表达意见，可以说「there seems to be a misunderstanding」。另外，可能在论文中的陈述方面存在问题，每个人的理解不一样，也会导致评审意见存在误差。因此，对于任何评审意见都要委婉。

3. 全面

对于评审意见应该全面的回答。不要因为某些评审意见不好回答都回避不回答了。

第一步 整理

把评审意见放在同一文件中，并且使用>进行标记。

如现在收到两个专家的评审意见，一个专家如是说

The paper is about [restatement of the abstract].

The main claimed contributions are:

1. X

2. Y

3. Z

However, I don't agree that X is novel.

I've seen it in [Foo, 1989].

Moreover, Y is trivial.

And, Z is simply incorrect by the [some argument].

In conclusion: strong reject.

另一个专家如是说

The paper is a clever generalization of [Foo, 1989].

The main claimed contributions are:

1. X

2. Y

3. Z

But, I see the real contribution as W.

In conclusion: strong accept.

可以把这些意见整理成这样

> -- Reviewer 1 --

> The paper is about [restatement of the abstract].

> The main claimed contributions are:

> 1. X

> 2. Y

> 3. Z

> However, I don't agree that X is novel.

> I've seen it in [Foo, 1989].

> Moreover, Y is trivial.

> And, Z is simply incorrect by the [some argument].

> In conclusion: strong reject.

> -- Reviewer 2 --

> The paper is a clever generalization of [Foo, 1989].

> The main claimed contributions are:

> 1. X

> 2. Y

> 3. Z

> But, I see the real contribution as W.

> In conclusion: strong accept.

第二步 逐个回答

接下来，需要就每个问题进行逐个回答

例如：

> -- Reviewer 1 --

> The paper is about [restatement of the abstract].

The summary is accurate at a high-level, but misses some key details like A, B and C.

> The main claimed contributions are:

> 1. X

> 2. Y

> 3. Z

Agreed.

> However, I don't agree that X is novel.

> I've seen it in [Foo, 1989].

While [Foo, 1989] does contain a method for doing X in specific cases, we have generalized the method for *all* cases. Consider the following case:

[motivating case]

This case is beyond the limits of [Foo, 1989], while it is in scope for our technique. This is the key distinction in our work, and we discussed this in more detail in the related work on page 11.

> Moreover, Y is trivial.

While we agree that Y is *simple* once the construction is seen, we argue that it is not *trivial* to create this construction in the first place. If Y were trivial, we might have expected earlier work such as [3] and [4] to use it, yet they did not. Instead, they opted for a much more complicated partial solution.

> And, Z is simply incorrect by the [some argument].

It appears that there is a misunderstanding. We realize now that our presentation obscured some important facets of Z. The reviewer seems to think that Z is Z', and we would agree that Z' is incorrect.

> In conclusion: strong reject.

We respectfully disagree.

> -- Reviewer 2 --

> The paper is a clever generalization of [Foo, 1989].

This is an accurate summary.

> The main claimed contributions are:

> 1. X

> 2. Y

> 3. Z

We concur.

> But, I see the real contribution as W.

We thank the reviewer for raising the point. We agree: W is a real contribution.

> In conclusion: strong accept.

We agree.

第三步 突出重点

如果是会议投稿，评审专家可能需要审阅大量的回复，因此，需要把重要的观点放置在最前面，让评审专家一眼就能看到问题。

例如：

> The paper is a clever generalization of [Foo, 1989].

This is an accurate summary.

> And, Z is simply incorrect by the [some argument].

It appears that there is a misunderstanding. We realize now that our presentation obscured some important facets of Z. The reviewer seems to think that Z is Z', and we would agree that Z' is incorrect.

> However, I don't agree that X is novel.

> I've seen it in [Foo, 1989].

While [Foo, 1989] does contain a method for doing X in specific cases, we have generalized the method for *all* cases. Consider the following case:

[motivating case]

This case is beyond the limits of [Foo, 1989], while it is in scope for our technique. This is the key distinction in our work, and we discussed this in more detail in the related work on page 11.

> Moreover, Y is trivial.

While we agree that Y is *simple* once the construction is seen, we argue that it is not *trivial* to create this construction in the first place. If Y were trivial, we might have expected earlier work such as [3] and [4] to use it, yet they did not. Instead, they opted for a much more complicated partial solution.

> But, I see the real contribution as W.

We thank the reviewer for raising the point. We agree: W is a real contribution.

> The paper is about [restatement of the abstract].

The summary is accurate at a high-level, but misses some key details like A, B and C.

> The main claimed contributions are:

> 1. X

> 2. Y

> 3. Z

Agreed.

> The main claimed contributions are:

> 1. X

> 2. Y

> 3. Z

We concur.

> In conclusion: strong accept.

We agree.

> In conclusion: strong reject.

We respectfully disagree.

第四步 精简

如果回复有字数限制，或者多个审稿者的审稿意见之间有重复的内容，可以对回复内容进行精简。可以从最后的问题开始。

例如：

> The paper is a clever generalization of [Foo, 1989].

This is an accurate summary.

> And, Z is simply incorrect by the [some argument].

It appears that there is a misunderstanding. We realize now that our presentation obscured some important facets of Z. The reviewer seems to think that Z is Z', and we would agree that Z' is incorrect.

> However, I don't agree that X is novel.

> I've seen it in [Foo, 1989].

While [Foo, 1989] does contain a method for doing X in specific cases, we have generalized the method for *all* cases. Consider the following case:

[motivating case]

This case is beyond the limits of [Foo, 1989], while it is in scope for our technique. This is the key distinction in our work, and we discussed this in more detail in the related work on page 11.

> Moreover, Y is trivial.

While we agree that Y is *simple* once the construction is seen, we argue that it is not *trivial* to create this construction in the first place. If Y were trivial, we might have expected earlier work such as [3] and [4] to use it, yet they did not. Instead, they opted for a much more complicated partial solution.

> But, I see the real contribution as W.

We thank the reviewer for raising the point. We agree: W is a real contribution.

> The paper is about [restatement of the abstract].

The summary is accurate at a high-level, but misses some key details like A, B and C.

第五步 润色

现在，可以开始编辑一下回复了。

如果是会议投稿，注意把审稿者所写的关于论文最简练准确的摘要放在回复的最前面。因为会议开始之前，很多人并未读过论文，也不大可能想通读一下整个回复。但是，他们可能会对回复的第一段瞟上一眼。把摘要放在前面可以让他们对整个论文有个大体的印象。另外，不要吝啬添加一下「thank you」之类的客气话。

在编辑回复之前，要站在审稿者的角度考虑问题。如果您是审稿者，对这样的回复满意不？

例如：

We thank the reviewers for the time and expertise

they have invested in these reviews.

> The paper is a clever generalization of [Foo, 1989].

This is an accurate summary, and we'd like to amplify the recognition of W as an additional contribution of the work by reviewer 2.

We'll reply to individual points below:

> And, Z is simply incorrect by the [some argument].

It appears that there is a misunderstanding. We realize now that our presentation obscured some important facets of Z. The reviewer seems to think that Z is Z', and we would agree that Z' is incorrect.

> However, I don't agree that X is novel.

> I've seen it in [Foo, 1989].

While [Foo, 1989] does contain a method for doing X in specific cases, we have generalized the method for *all* cases. Consider the following case:

[motivating case]

This case is beyond the limits of [Foo, 1989], while it is in scope for our technique. This is the key distinction in our work, and we discussed this in more detail in the related work on page 11.

> Moreover, Y is trivial.

While we agree that Y is *simple* once the construction is seen, we argue that it is not *trivial* to create this construction in the first place. If Y were trivial, we might have expected earlier work such as [3] and [4] to use it, yet they did not. Instead, they opted for a much more complicated partial solution.

> But, I see the real contribution as W.

We thank the reviewer for raising the point. We agree: W is a real contribution.

> The paper is about [restatement of the abstract].

The summary is accurate at a high-level, but misses some key details like A, B and C.

第六步 核对

好了，SCI投稿评审意见回复完毕之后先放松一下，然后仔细核对核对，看看有无遗漏的问题，如无，然后提交回复吧。

更多 论文写作 请访问 <https://www.iikx.com/news/article/>

本文版权归原作者所有，请勿用于商业用途，[爱科学iikx.com](http://www.iikx.com)转发